STATE TEACHERS
JOHNSON CITY, TEN

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXVII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1936 NUMBER 1126

Contents

The Week 223

Editorials
Al Smith to Right of Them, Coughlin to Left of Them 226
An Open Letter to Mr. Landon 227
A Straight Tip on Gold 228
The Munitions Committee Reports 229

General Articles
Storm over Palestine ..... H. N. Brailsford 230
McReynolds, Roberts and Hughes ..... Ernest Sutherland Bates 232
Arkansas Flogging ..... Willie Sue Blagden 236
Three Long Days ..... Felix Ray 237
Suicide of a Dreamer ..... Bruce Bliven 238
Pity Ulysses (verse) ..... Virginia Hamilton 239
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 240
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 241
The Bandwagon 242

Correspondence 243

Books in Review
Property as an Absolute ..... Kenneth Burke 245
Friend of the Apaches ..... John Collier 246
Knowledge of Necessity ..... Newton Arvin 247
The Ace of Tough Reporters ..... George Seldes 247
The Kentucky Hills ..... George Milburn 248
Czech Statesmen ..... Hans Kohn 248
Condensation ..... Isidor Schneider 249
Books in Brief 249

The Week

ON THE eve of the Democratic National Convention two important political developments took place last week. A new Union Party was announced, with Representative William Lemke of North Dakota as its presidential candidate and support expected from the Coughlinites, Townsendites and followers of the late Huey Long. It was widely believed that W. R. Hearst was behind the new party, hoping through it to defeat Mr. Roosevelt. A more direct attack came from the Right when Al Smith and four other disgruntled conservative Democrats issued a sharp attack on the New Deal. Political experts generally assume that opposition from this quarter will do Mr. Roosevelt more good than harm. . . . As the convention opened it seemed probable that the famous two-thirds rule would be abrogated and that the creation of the Union Party would result in a platform somewhat more to the Left than was expected. . . . The Seventy-fourth Congress, adjourning in the early hours of Sunday morning, failed to pass almost all of the important New Deal bills that were pending, devoting its final hours chiefly to the tax and ship-subsidy proposals. . . . Harry Hopkins announced a new and liberalized policy in regard to employment on W.P.A. projects, opening the gates to practically all unemployed persons, whether previously on relief or not, and giving state administrators a large degree of autonomy. . . . The Department of Justice was charged with the task of prosecuting four big steel companies accused of collusive bidding on several government projects and one of these companies, the Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation, was rejected by Secretary Ickes as a bidder on the Imperial Dam, because it is fighting the Wagner Labor Relations Act in the courts. . . . Lack of rain in the Dakotas and Montana threatened a new drought, which may be the most serious of all.

THE British government has now formally confirmed the abandonment of sanctions, as everyone knew it would. The future of the League of Nations is clouded with uncertainty, but whatever happens, the effort to compel peace through its machinery has been dropped. There are persistent reports of a new understanding between Great Britain and Italy, one of whose features is joint military control of the Mediterranean area. It is also reported that Mussolini and Hitler are coming closer together, the first step being a commercial arrangement. While Great Britain will not at present recognize the conquest of Ethiopia, or give loans or credits to Italy, there is no guarantee that she will not take both these steps a little later. . . . Sporadic strikes involving many thousands of workers continue in Belgium, France and Spain. In France, four-fifths of those recently on strike have returned to their tasks, as the Blum government rushes through legislation confirming the promises made to the strikers. The efforts to disband the Fascist organizations are bitterly resisted, with street fighting between Right and Left groups. . . . In China, the threat of civil war between the Nanking and Canton forces appears more serious. Additional Japanese troops have been sent into North China, and the only question still undecided is whether the whole area north of the Yellow River will be made a part of Manchukuo or a separate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dummy republic. . . . Canada's "New Deal" has suffered a fate paralleling the American experience. The Canadian Supreme Court has given an advisory opinion outlawing the ten measures put through by the Conservative Government before it lost power in the last election. Since most of these measures were not yet in effect and since the decision will be appealed to the Privy Council in London, the decision has as yet no practical importance.

THE Tory government of Great Britain is pursuing a policy of *Realpolitik* in international affairs with a vengeance. Not only does it propose to abandon the whole idea of sanctions, but it is making peace with Italy on humiliating terms. Competent observers believe that after the lapse of a few months, when the English pacifists have had time to cool off, the conquest of Ethiopia will be recognized, and perhaps a substantial loan made to the Italian government. The new military understanding by which England and Italy share the authority in the Mediterranean area is a step most people would not have believed possible a few months ago; The New Republic was denounced by some of its readers as incurably pessimistic for predicting substantially this outcome. The worst part of the whole sordid business is the carte blanche that is given to Hitler. The whole world now sees that an imperialist adventurer can resort to wholesale piracy and, if successful, get away with it. This is exactly what Hitler has been doing and is planning to do on an even greater scale. The next step, already hinted at, is a British understanding with Germany, to supplement the existing naval treaty. The world is back to that jungle morality which, indeed, was never really abandoned; the system of alliances is the prelude to the new world war whose guns are already muttering just over the horizon.

THE closing hours of the Seventy-fourth Congress furnished a sorry record for Mr. Roosevelt to use in his effort to capture the votes of the progressives that he so badly needs in this year's election. The Wagner housing bill was allowed to die. So was the new proposal to regulate the coal industry. So was the badly needed revision of the Pure Food and Drug Act. The plan to register lobbyists in Washington and force them to reveal sources of their income went down to defeat. The tax bill, which was number one on the "must" list, is a hodgepodge that, as usual, attempts to reconcile the irreconcilable. It provides taxes on undistributed corporate surplus, but only on a sliding scale from 7 to 27 percent. Corporation income taxes will be 8 to 15 percent instead of the present 12.5 to 15. The new ship-subsidy bill is at least more candid than the former one, but it still represents a policy of dubious military value and one for which there is no economic justification whatever. The chain-store law is an attempt, though a clumsy one, to penalize mere bigness. The law providing that N.R.A. standards must be maintained on government contracts is a short step in the right direction: it sets up a maximum work week and provides for the maintenance of "prevailing wages" but is silent on the all-important question of collective bargaining. Nothing was done even looking toward government control or ownership of the munitions industry, or perfecting our present inadequate neutrality law. Over against this melancholy list may be set the provisions for rural electrification and soil conservation, the defeat of two dangerous measures, the Kramer sedition and the Tydings-McCormack military-disaffection bills, and the law prohibiting interstate transportation of strikebreakers.

SECRETARY Wallace was moderate in his expression when he said the other day that no one could any more carry out the parts of the Republican platform referring to agriculture and foreign trade than he could jump to the moon. Of all the inconsistencies and absurdities in that platform, the planks dealing with international affairs are the worst. The Republicans promise to increase exports and decrease imports, though every ten-year-old child should know by now that you cannot sell unless you buy. They propose to return to a universal high-tariff policy, while at the same time promising to coöperate in that international stabilization of currencies which such a policy would do much to prevent. They demand collection of the war debts while pledging themselves to keep out those goods from debtor countries without which it is a physical impossibility for even the most willing foreign debtor to pay. In one breath they denounce the World Court and call for a system of arbitrating international disputes. The authors of these planks must have been either incredibly stupid themselves, or believers in the incredible stupidity of the mass of the voters. We believe the second of these interpretations is correct.

ALTHOUGH more and more reports of the terrorism in northeastern Arkansas are confirmed, Governor Futrell is still trying to lay the blame for them on that old and outworn scarecrow, the "foreign agitator." The latest incidents in the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union strike include the flogging of Willie Sue Blagden and her companion that is described in this issue of The New Republic, and the arrest in Chicago for extradition of Sam Bennett, a forty-five-year-old Negro who escaped from Arkansas after defying an overseer who attempted to put him to work. If Bennett is returned to the strike area on the seemingly groundless charge of assault with intent to kill, the probability is that he will be mobbed. Meanwhile the investigations of Mr. Sam E. Whitaker, the special investigator appointed by Attorney General Cummings, have resulted in the freeing of thirteen persons held in violation of the federal peonage act, but that is all. His investigation of Miss Blagden's case is not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

likely to prove very effective, either, unless public opinion, which certain groups are now trying to mobilize, should demand that the illegal and violent grip of the plantation owners over this section of the country be broken. Few would question the fairness of the demands of the strikers, who want their wages raised from 7½ cents to 15 cents an hour for a ten-hour day.

JUST at the point of actual starvation, the unemployed of New Jersey have been almost providentially rescued by $6,000,000 obtained from the inheritance taxes on the estate of John T. Dorrance, Campbell soup king. The money is to be doled out to the municipalities by a commission headed by Governor Hoffman. At the same time the mayors of forty New Jersey cities informed the legislature that at least $10,000,000 of state aid was needed for the remainder of the calendar year 1936. As we reported last week, under municipal control the relief rolls have been cut 25 to 50 percent and the state has gone back to Elizabethan methods of caring for the unfortunate. The cities have provided only food and milk on a basis of four cents per meal per person. The unemployed have been left to obtain rent, fuel and clothing in any way they could. In the face of this inhumanity the newspapers of New Jersey have congratulated the citizens that the expected relief riots have failed to occur.

FOR many years it has been a popular American myth that during the Great War, the American Army paid rent for the trenches from which it fought in France. This allegation has been made to support the charge that the French are a parsimonious race, and has probably played a part in the creation of public sentiment on the war debts and other questions. As with so many other popular myths, the only trouble with this one is that it is false. Major General James G. Harbord, responding to an inquiry by The New Republic, assures us that no rent was ever paid for trenches in France occupied or used for offensive or defensive purposes and, so far as he knows, no request for payment was ever made. As General Harbord was in command of the Services of Supply for the American Expeditionary Forces this would seem to be conclusive. It is true, however, that land back of the divisional areas was rented for training purposes, and when trenches were constructed on this land the damages were paid for. This was the practice in the United States, and General Harbord is confident that it was the practice of the other Allies in France and of the French themselves.

COLLECTORS of Hearstiana will be interested in two items that come along in the week's news. The Ministers' Council for Social Action, recently formed in the borough of Queens in New York City, shows highly laudable spunk in announcing plans for preaching sermons against Hearst on the week-end of Sunday, June 28. The executive committee of the Council includes ministers of Methodist, Baptist, Congregational and Jewish churches and their official statement says of Hearst, "No single man has exercised so destructive and immoral an influence in dragging into the gutter those very ideals for which all religious institutions stand." The Ministers' Council for Social Action says that its purpose is to "encourage concerted expression of ethical opinion on social issues," and we sincerely hope its present drive, including the proposal to observe Independence Day as "Anti-Hearst Day," will catch on with religious leaders throughout the country. The other news item concerns our bounden duty to inform Mr. Hearst that Professor George S. Counts, of Teachers' College, Columbia University, has been invited to deliver a lecture at Northwestern University. Readers of these pages will remember that it was on the strength of a scheduled delivery of two lectures by Professor Counts that Mr. Hearst forbade any mention of the name of Stanford University in his newspapers. Northwestern University must now be added to the list. If American universities continue to show their present high—and assuredly justified—regard for Professor Counts, practically every major institution in the country will be automatically voting itself out of the Hearst newspapers.

THE Bandwagon in our issue dated April 15 included an item from The New York Herald Tribune describing a radio address of Fred G. Clark, National Commander of the Crusaders, as follows: "Clark said he had no objections to teachers describing conditions in the Soviet Union so long as they made it clear that conditions there were bad." Mr. Clark has written to us and also to The Herald Tribune objecting to this interpretation of his remarks and enclosing a copy of his speech. We quote part of it: "It isn't telling the truth about Communist Russia that is causing so much excitement among clear-thinking people. What we object to is for school teachers to hold up the Communist government of Russia as the acme of perfection, the pinnacle of human desirability and, while lauding Communism to the skies, to vilify the United States government and its Constitution in the same breath. . . . They do not tell their pupils that liberty is absolutely dead in Russia . . . that free speech and free press are totally prohibited by the Communist dictator . . . that free religious worship is prevented in Russia . . . that Communist officials, from the highest to the lowest, laugh at the word of God! . . . If they will tell these truths about Russia, where there is less liberty than in any country on the face of the globe, not one American mother or father will offer the slightest objection to information as to the worthwhile advances Russia is making in the matter of mass education." We now leave to our readers the decision as to whether or not the summary of The Herald Tribune was accurate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Al Smith to Right of Them, Coughlin to Left of Them

THE Democratic delegates as they meet in Philadelphia are between a cross-fire of volleys from the right and from the left. Al Smith and his cohorts have not waited to "take a walk"; in view of the foregone conclusion of the convention, which must endorse the New Deal and renominate Roosevelt, they have taken a running jump to the extreme right even of Mr. Landon's ranks. This will deprive the Democrats of no strength that they could have mustered in any case, and the thundering with which the revolt begins will serve only to consolidate the President's followers. The pronunciamento issued by Alfred E. Smith, Bainbridge Colby, former Senator James A. Reed, Daniel F. Cohalan and former Governor Joseph B. Ely of Massachusetts ought to be almost as great a help to the Democratic cause as was Al's Liberty League speech.

Almost every one of these gentlemen will be recognized as a sorehead by people who remember anything about politics. Al has been nursing his grudge for years. Bainbridge Colby is virtually a mouthpiece for William Randolph Hearst (the letter sounds like an inferior Hearst editorial). Senator Reed has not for many years been a master of anything but vituperation. Mr. Cohalan is an old Tammany heeler disappointed in his ambition for a judgeship. And Mr. Ely is an echo of Al Smith.

In the name of Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson and Grover Cleveland, the message calls upon the convention to be "American rather than anything else," by following the good old Republican prescription of the protective tariff. The party is to practise the familiar decalogue of conservative principles by taking "the heavy hand of government off of business," balancing the budget, putting "an end to the orgy of spending," preserving the Constitution and the separation of powers, with particular emphasis on the supremacy of a reactionary Supreme Court, keeping free from entangling alliances, and collecting the war debts (without, of course, accepting any of the goods by which these debts must be paid, if ever they are to be collected. Our industries and farms must not be "swamped by the goods and products of nations that are our industrial and farming rivals and competitors").

This message is a worthy reflection of its authors. As a piece of statesmanlike logic it is beneath contempt. The Republican platform is a masterpiece of liberalism compared with it. It is nothing more than a collection of mouth-filling slogans, entirely innocent of any real meaning as a practical program. The antique muzzle-loader aimed by these grizzled veterans seems to have burst at the breech; the attack should cause little but laughter. If only Mr. Landon could be persuaded to accept responsibility for these new recruits, the gain to the Democratic campaign would be considerable, but probably he is much too canny to do it.

The formation on the left of the Democratic army is far more formidable, and ought to give the President serious concern. Father Coughlin, though his logic is no better than that of Messrs. Smith and Colby and his program is just as far from being realistic or consistent, is thought by many hundreds of thousands, and possibly even by millions of voters, to be a real leader towards a new order in which their legitimate demands could be satisfied. The same is true of Dr. Townsend. When these men combine in support of Congressman Lemke, one of the authors of the inflationary farm-mortgage refinancing bill that has several times come within an ace of becoming law, enough voters may be drawn from the more progressive of the two major parties to change the result in doubtful and crucial states. It has long been the position of The New Republic that the principal political danger to Mr. Roosevelt would arise from his failure to satisfy popular discontent by sufficiently drastic measures rather than from hostility of reactionary business and financial interests. The latter were certain to be against him anyway, as long as he was in the least unorthodox. Every time he compromised with them, he made less effective the measures intended to benefit the farmers, the workers and the other "forgotten men." The dissatisfaction of the latter with results would enable the reactionaries to make still more headway against the administration.

The Coughlin-Townsend-Lemke Union Party is being referred to as "radical" by the press. This term is a semi-accurate description of the tendency of its followers. They want a system in which they will not be exploited by owners of property. They want security in old age. They want abundant production and distribution. But the programs that their leaders offer them are far from radical. Inflation is of course no remedy for anything, even if it were achieved by the confusion of methods proposed. When coupled, as it is in the new platform, with exclusive nationalism and heavy armament, it becomes definitely fascistic. A leader who proposes to satisfy justifiable discontent by means totally inadequate to the end proclaimed, and at the same time condemns the genuine and carefully thought-out programs for social reorganization, is in danger of landing his followers just where Hitler has landed his in Germany.

The peril of this sort of development is one of the chief reasons why The New Republic advocated in this campaign the formation of a real Farmer-Labor party, which could offer the oppressed at least an approach to a sound philosophy and a realistic program. The progressive cohorts of labor refrained from this step because of their fear of defeating Roosevelt. It would be a tragedy if this decision on their part had the result of turning a budding movement of protest over to irresponsible leadership, while Roosevelt was defeated anyway.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Open Letter to Mr. Landon

THE Republican platform, to which you have given your allegiance, promises to "preserve the American system of free enterprise, private competition and equality of opportunity." In a later section it asserts, "A private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. It menaces and if continued will utterly destroy constitutional government and the liberty of the citizen. We favor rigorous enforcement of criminal laws, as well as civil laws, against monopolies and trusts and their officials, and we demand the enactment of such additional legislation as is necessary to make it impossible for private monopoly to exist in the United States."

The steel industry has a long record of monopolistic practices. The Federal Trade Commission has just completed an investigation of bids for steel sheet piling submitted to the United States governmen on three P.W.A. contracts. The Commission found that production of steel sheet piling is concentrated in the hands of four concerns, the United States Steel Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, the Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation and the Inland Steel Company. It found that these companies were quoting identical delivered prices for these contracts. They admitted that they were acting pursuant to a resolution of the industry continuing in effect the N.R.A. code—although the Recovery Act is not now law, having been declared unconstitutional. This fixing of prices is called by the President, and justly, we believe, "collusive bidding."

The Trade Commission points out that when mills in one area sell into the area governed by another basing point, they must abide by the price of the other basing point, even though it is higher than their own. It states that the entire price structure of the iron and steel industry is the result of an elaborate concert of action among supposedly competing firms. This is true also of other industries, some of them closely affiliated with steel, like cement. Identity of delivered prices on steel products generally is preserved to fractions of a tenth of a cent by elaborate formulas worked out by the Iron and Steel Institute.

In reply to the President's question as to whether the quoted prices were fair and reasonable, the Commission replied that it could not say they were. This is because "the tendency of any price-fixing combination is to foster inefficiency and to prevent the low-cost producer from passing on to the consumer the benefit of his efficiency in the form of lower prices. The reasonableness of prices depends in part on whether they are supported by a policy of restricted production that increases unit costs of production. No progress can be made toward determining the reasonableness of piling prices without knowledge of the cost of producing piling, and this the piling producers refused to disclose."

The President, after receiving this report, sent it to the Attorney General for "appropriate action." He also asked for a draft of a letter to be sent to government purchasing agents so that they might give evidence of any other collusive bidding. And he asked for recommendations for any necessary new legislation to deal with these unfair practices.

Now, Mr. Landon, here is as clear a case of monopoly as could well be imagined. The Republican platform uses strong language on the subject. But many people are dubious whether it means what it says. They doubt whether a Republican administration would attack the steel industry, or any other powerful industry. Here is a chance for you to prove, in a specific case, whether or not you and your party are sincere. Do you endorse the President's stand? Do you favor criminal prosecution, as well as civil action, against the officers of these steel companies? Or, if this is proved to be impossible under present laws, do you support legislation that would make it possible? Let's come down to cases. If you fail to take advantage of this opportunity to make your position clear, voters are justified in regarding your platform as so much ballyhoo.

There is another related matter. The Republican platform pledges the party to "protect the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of its own choosing without interference from any source." Labor in the steel industry has never been permitted by the employers to exercise these rights. The steel companies have never consented to bargain collectively with the workers in any genuine sense. They have even declined to talk at all with the representatives of the workers' own choosing, if the representatives happened to be national unions, independent of the employer, or officials of those unions. At present a great organizing campaign has just begun in the steel industry. Workers are being invited to join a union, the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, which can adequately represent them. What is your position in this specific case? Do you favor protection of the workers' right to join and bargain through this union, against the inevitable attempts by the employers to interfere with that right? Or, on the other hand, do you make hash of your platform's promise by remaining neutral, or even by pretending, as the employers do, that it is the genuine union which is "interfering" with labor's right to organize, a right now expressed only, so far as it can be said to be expressed at all, through employer-fostered representation plans? The words "from any source" tacked on to the word "interference" in the Republican plank has made many suspect that this will be your excuse. We ought to know now, while the issue is before us, and in advance of the election, whether this is true.

What, Mr. Landon, is your application of your political principles to steel price-fixing and steel labor relations?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Straight Tip on Gold

THE MONETARY issue has been aroused from its slumber of recent months to take part in the campaign. The conservatives, as usual, adhere to that symbol of faith, the gold standard. The Republican platform declares in favor of "a sound currency to be preserved at all hazards." It opposes further devaluation of the dollar and turns its face away from a managed currency by advocating the repeal of all laws delegating to the Executive the power of Congress "to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Mr. Landon adds to this that the currency must be "expressed in terms of gold and convertible into gold." He qualifies his adherence to the full gold standard only by stating that it should not be restored until this can be done "without penalizing our democratic economy and without injury to our producers of agricultural products and other raw materials."

At the other extreme, the inflationary interests throw the gold standard over altogether. Lemke and Coughlin want Congress to create money, and a lot of it, just by voting the issue of paper certificates, or what not. In their view, the rule of the private banking system over the issuance of currency—associated closely, of course, with the gold standard—accounts for all our ills. Print enough money, they think, and everybody will be comfortable and secure. Likewise certain industrialists and speculators, such as those affiliated with the Committee for the Nation, want a currency managed for inflationary purposes.

The traditional logic of all this is plain enough; it is the same as when William Jennings Bryan made his "Cross of Gold" speech. If currency is based on gold and convertible into gold, the amount of the gold reserve puts an automatic limit on the amount of currency that can be issued. Conservatives believe that this prevents unsound expansion of the means of payment, skyrocketing prices, inflation and indirect repudiation of debts. They believe that automatic currency management of this kind is preferable to management by political authorities, who cannot be trusted to resist inflationary pressure. Monetary radicals believe that the limit set to the expansion of currency by the gold standard enables bankers to profit by exorbitant interest rates, favors the creditors as against the debtors, and milks the farmers in the interest of Wall Street.

We should like to give a broad hint to both sides of this controversy. Conditions have so changed since the framing of their arguments that their major premise is the exact contrary of the facts. They both begin by assuming that there is a shortage of gold. They look only at the upper boundary imposed upon the quantity of money by the limited amount of metal. But there is no shortage of gold; there is now an immense surplus. In the United States, the monetary gold stock has risen from $4,000,000,000 in 1930 to nearly $10,500,000,000. The excess reserves of banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System—that is, reserves in excess of the amount required by law against existing issues of money and credit—approximate $6,000,000,000. About $60,000,000,000 of additional loans could be made against these reserves. Complete adherence to the gold standard would not prevent the issuance of money enough and the extension of credit enough to satisfy the wildest dreams of the inflationists.

Nor is this purely an American condition. The London Economist in its June 13 issue points out that the world production of gold has increased by leaps and bounds in recent years. The previous record year was 1915, when total production reached 23,000,000 fine ounces. In 1935 the output was 31,000,000. And it is continuing to grow—not only in South Africa but in Canada, Russia and elsewhere. Considering the probable advance of output in the Soviet Union and South Africa alone, the total will probably reach 40,000,000 ounces by 1940, or twice the ordinary annual output to which we have been accustomed. Not only is this true, but existing supplies of monetary gold have been augmented by transfer from non-monetary uses. The world's stock of monetary gold has increased by 32.7 percent between 1929 and 1935, and annual production will increase it by a further 4½ percent a year.

In addition, the efficiency of gold as a monetary standard has been so increased by devaluation in this and many other countries that when the final stabilization is made, the world can probably issue twice as much money and credit, based on gold, as it could in 1929. Writes The Economist: "There is a greater unused supply of money, or potential money, in existence now than ever before in the history of mankind. The gold of the Incas which is supposed to have started the sixteenth-century inflation, the gold of California after 1848, the gold of the Rand in the 1890's—all these were trifles compared with the increased supply of gold (measured by its monetary value) which has piled up in the last five years. And this piling-up has occurred at a time when the dominant monetary philosophy is one of expansion. Unless the lessons of all monetary history are falsified, a very large rise of prices is in prospect."

The inevitable conclusion is that the conservatives and the inflationists ought to exchange their monetary planks. We can assure Father Coughlin and Mr. Lemke that nothing is more likely to lead to substantial inflation than Mr. Landon's currency "expressed in terms of gold and convertible into gold," coupled with the Republican promise to take away from the Executive all powers of monetary management. We can likewise assure Mr. Landon that if he really wants a sound currency with a stable purchasing power, he must have an almost completely managed one, depending not at all, or very little, on gold. For unless the prospective effect

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on money of the present enormous gold stock is neutralized in some way, there is likely to come sooner or later an inflationary boom such as the world has never known.

The Munitions Committee Reports

IN ITS report to the Senate on the Morgan hearings the Munitions Committee makes two concrete suggestions for legislative action: a strict control on loans and credits to belligerent governments, whether granted directly or indirectly, and revision of the American position on armed merchantmen. Almost all shades of public opinion are in favor of banning loans to belligerents, and the mechanism of credit control proposed by the Committee—the use by the President of the powers of the Trading with the Enemy Act—seems an ingenious way to solve the difficult problem of forbidding direct or indirect long-term government borrowing without killing all commerce in the process. Some of the peace groups have been willing to go even to this extent—which, judging by its noncommittal stand on the question of commercial embargoes, the Committee is unwilling to do—but 100-percent non-intercourse with belligerents is probably undesirable and almost certainly impossible. To attempt it would be to end in no neutrality legislation at all.

For this reason the Committee's second legislative proposal, the redefinition of the status of armed merchantmen, is of more importance than the peace groups have yet appeared to realize. By continuing the position of 1917, which we still officially hold, that as neutrals we cannot permit submarines to sink armed vessels without warning, although, to be sure, the merchantman will sink the submarine as soon as she rises to give the warning, we bind ourselves to the simple course of defending our right as a neutral to go to war with any power that uses submarines. The Committee's recommendation in this matter is a compromise. Instead of a ban against armed merchantmen—probably an impossibility today—it suggests a definition that classifies such vessels as merchantmen in port and warships at sea. Further, it suggests that they be forbidden to carry passengers, thus ending the hazard of the loss of American lives. This seems a far simpler way of avoiding dangerous international tension than any elaborate attempt to forbid the export of contraband or the establishing of war zones through which American vessels may not sail. Furthermore, it covers foreign vessels also—and it is to be remembered that our quarrel with Germany was essentially over the sinking of British vessels.

In regard to what the Morgan hearings showed concerning America's entry into the World War, the Committee's findings are gently worded but very much to the point. It finds, for example, that the State Department secretly altered its loan policy in October, 1914, informing no one—not even the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate—except J. P. Morgan and Company and the National City Bank. It finds that the Morgan firm's withdrawal from the exchange market and the resulting break in sterling exchange in the summer of 1915 "may very well have been deliberately arranged to bring pressure on the United States to change its loan policy." It finds, and this in a way is oddly amusing, that certain transactions indicated "perfect awareness on the part of J. P. Morgan and Company of the influence of business sentiment on government policy and of the methods of exerting compelling pressure on an administration." This may be carrying coals to Newcastle, but it is reassuring to discover that the Committee is not so naïve as some of the Morgan statements would indicate the Morgans are, or would like to appear to be. Essentially the Committee finds that the Morgans held a key position to influence government policy during the years of our neutrality and used that position not to "drag us in" but to steer us bit by bit to a situation from which there was no way out but war. The Committee is dealing with the realities of government, not its surface trifles.

After a good word for the ideals of President Wilson, the Committee damns his judgment. It comes to the conclusion that as early as December, 1916, he had determined to bring the country into the War—which was mistake enough—and then allowed the British to form a pretty good idea of his intentions. The Committee traces the result: the sudden suspension by the British of security sales—securities which were, of course, the fabric of the British commercial empire—and the calm reliance on "demand" loans from Morgan's. Here is perhaps the real explanation of the fantastic heights reached by those loans in April, 1917, and of Ambassador Page's famous concern that they were passing beyond the ability of the Morgan firm to handle.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1936, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Storm Over Palestine

DESTINY compels the Jews to build their National Home in Palestine, as Nehemiah built his Temple, with trowel in one hand and sword in the other. The resistance of the Arabs is today even more openly and defiantly organized than in the three previous efforts. If there has been no massacre, that is because General Wauchope has shown in his police measures a capacity and firmness that some of his predecessors lacked, while the Jewish colonists are now permitted to defend their settlements. But the loss of life by sporadic murder mounts to an ugly total, and the Arabs have followed the tradition of all civil war in the East by destroying young trees and burning forests.

There is no particular reason why they should have chosen this moment for an attempt to intimidate the Mandatory Power by a general strike that borrowed from Mr. Gandhi everything save his non-violence. They may have felt, as they watched the humiliation of the Empire at Italy's hands, that any retreat, however abject, is thinkable under Mr. Baldwin's leadership. They were certainly incited by propaganda, broadcast in Arabic from the Italian station at Bari, and money from some outside source, perhaps Italian, is said to have reached the Strike Committee. But it would be a mistake to stress such explanations as these. Few Arabs possess a radio set, and it costs nothing to burn down trees, or to stab a Jew in the dark. The Arabs have from the start of this risky experiment been as violently opposed to mass Jewish immigration as they are today. If there was a special reason, it was doubtless the large number—60,000—admitted last year, for the Arabs timed their protest for the date on which the half-yearly quota falls to be fixed. One may presume that their leaders were aware of the plans now being made to settle large numbers of the younger generation of Hitler's victims in Palestine. Arab nationalism seconded Aryan brutality in refusing a home to this unhappy race.

There is no need to seek out elaborate reasons for this hostility to Zionism. The Arabs fear that they will be swamped, in a land they have held for twelve centuries, by an alien race incomparably their superior in culture, wealth and organization. That is explanation enough, though it may also be true that they dislike the quick tempo of the machine age that the Jews have brought with them. There is no valid economic ground for their opposition. On the contrary, they are striking against prosperity.

Palestine was in 1919 one of the most backward and poverty-stricken regions of the East. The Jews, bringing capital and science, made it even in the years of slump the one corner of our planet, outside Soviet Russia, that thrives and progresses. They brought electricity: they introduced flourishing industries where industry was unknown: they taught such Arabs as would learn their own technique of irrigation and made available the new breeds of plants and animals perfected by their research. They drained the marshes and fought malaria. Out of their taxes the British administration has built roads, railways and harbors, and provided for the Arabs modern schools and hospitals. Unemployment is virtually unknown, and Arab labor flocks in from Syria and Egypt to enjoy wages that stand at three times the level of those countries. That, indeed, is part of the explanation of this hostility. Arab society is dominated by a feudal landowning caste, which regards high wages, the eight-hour day and the beginnings of labor unionism as the most pernicious of all the innovations the Jews have introduced. It is significant that in order to rouse the masses the gentry have had to play on their fanaticism, for on this occasion, as on the last, the Grand Mufti has preached about an imaginary Jewish design to reërect the Temple on the holy places of Islam.

The reader may recollect Arab propaganda to the effect that the Jews are driving the Arab peasants off the land. Broadly, this charge is untrue. The mass of the Jewish immigration goes into industry and not onto the land. The really distinguished part of the Jewish achievement is that sand dunes and marshes, uninhabited and untilled, have been converted by electric pumps into orange groves and wheat fields. In other cases the Jews, by purchasing part of an ill utilized Arab estate, provided the owner with capital which enabled him to irrigate the rest, and so to furnish a better living for a much larger number of Arabs than the land had formerly nourished.

One must have seen the miracles that Jewish intelligence and devotion have wrought, above all in the socialist communal settlements, to understand what this process means. The fact is that the coming of the Jews has started a general development from dry farming and domestic economy by the methods of the Bronze Age, to scientific agriculture by irrigation for export. This barren land can sustain a considerably larger population both of Arabs and Jews, and on its fringes there is ample room in the still undeveloped Trans-Jordania. In fact, the Arab population has doubled since 1919. If the British administration had more creative imagination than it has yet shown, it would hasten this process by providing the Arab peasants with the means to irrigate their land, and with a disinterested marketing organization for their produce. But little can be done for them until they are freed, above all the sharecroppers among them, from the exploita-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of their usurious landlords. The Arab laborer, since the Jews came, has seen his standard of living swiftly rising, but the tenant and the small owner are sunk in a subhuman misery. If the British would attack this agrarian problem in a large way, they would find their political difficulties eased. For by liberating the sharecroppers they would break the social power of the feudal gentry, who are the leaders of the Arab opposition.

When one has seen the conditions under which these two races dwell side by side, the main impression is anxiety that wrestles with hope. As one moves from one Jewish settlement to another, one forecasts a brilliant future for this experiment as much on its cultural as on its material side. But below it and around it is the Arab mass, ignorant, impoverished, the prey of much preventable disease, aloof, hostile, untouched as yet by the ideas that the Jews might disseminate and, for all its propinquity, out of reach. Because these Arabs will not welcome or even tolerate the Jews, this country must be governed by force. If the British garrison were withdrawn, the Jewish National Home would soon be a bloody ruin. The consequence is that outside the municipal sphere there can be no advance towards self-government. The Colonial Office wishes, indeed, to set up a representative council. It would be unworkable, so long as the Arabs retain their majority and persist in their uncompromising resistance to Jewish settlement.

The British will doubtless continue to administer the Mandate, but they will do it without enthusiasm or conviction. That, I think, and not anti-Semitism or any excessive enthusiasm for the Arabs is, on the whole, the attitude of the responsible civil servants, whether on the spot or in London. It is a weary, anxious and thankless task, but honor and prestige, to say nothing of strategy, forbid the Empire to relinquish it. The Zionists will say that when their numbers rise from the present 28 percent to the neighborhood of 50, the Arabs will acquiesce in the accomplished fact. It may be so, but the Arabs think in terms of a vaster unit. If ever they can link their destiny with Syria or Egypt or both, the Jews will be a helpless minority.

On general grounds it is easy with a clear conscience to defend the Mandate. A backward race has no right to monopolize land of which it makes no adequate use. Mankind, when it is organized, must have the right to override tribal nationalism, if in the process it attends to the welfare of the tribe whose ignorant will it overrules. To the Jews mankind owed this reparation, and Hitler has increased our already heavy obligation. One may write this and adhere to it, even when one knows all the awkward facts of the case. The League was not the disinterested tribunal of all humanity: it drew this Mandate to the victors' specifications. The British nation assuredly was moved by a sincere sympathy with the Jews, but its rulers had sundry subsidiary motives—to win the good will of Jewish finance, to defend the Suez Canal, to utilize Haifa for the pipeline from the Mosul oilfield.

History presents the usual cross-web. One gains little now by retrospective judgments. The thing has been done, and while the British Empire remains an Empire and a League survives in Geneva, the experiment will go on. It is justified if in the end it makes not merely a Jewish Home, but a happy land out of Palestine. It is proper that somewhere on this earth this race should have its cultural center—a university built among orange groves and wheatfields tilled by its own hands. It is right that a refuge should be found in the land they love for some hundreds of thousands of fugitives from German and Polish intolerance. But mankind and the Jews will alike pay a heavy price, if the Arabs remain bitter, violent and unreconciled. A home is no home, if one must guard it with a machine gun on the doorstep.

What might be done, while retaining the Mandate, to promote first acquiescence and then reconciliation? My first suggestion may seem paradoxical. I think the process of Jewish settlement goes too slowly. If it could have been done by shock tactics in the early years the Arabs would have adjusted themselves the sooner. This gradual annual infiltration is the most exasperating method that could have been chosen, for it tempts the Arabs to believe that they have still a chance by agitation to slow it down, if not to stop it altogether. The settlement should be completed as rapidly as finances permit, for the case is as urgent on the German as it is on the Palestinian side. In the second place, the British have at times betrayed a very evident hesitation. To go on appointing royal commissions of inquiry after every outbreak is to suggest an infirmity of purpose that the Arabs are quick to perceive. Again, it is not edifying to note the restraint shown in dealing with the more distinguished leaders of the Arab revolt. The Grand Mufti, the chief preacher of fanaticism, goes free, while humble rioters are duly punished.

But the chief way in which the British could contribute to the happiness of Palestine would be by tackling the agrarian problem. I should like to see this done on socialist lines, but short of this why should even a Tory government hesitate to do for Arab sharecroppers what their fathers did for Irish tenants? An ill nourished, illiterate peasantry, sodden with malaria, can be persuaded that the Jews are the authors of its misery. End this misery, and it will be increasingly difficult for them to blame the Jews. The British have done much good work for the Arabs through education and other social services, but they have so far shirked the central problem of land ownership.

Finally, in some measure the Jews have their fate in their own hands. It is difficult for them to mix with Arab peasants and workers. The gap in culture and in social habits is too wide. But they might try a little harder. They do learn Arabic at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school, but few ever master it. They have done something to organize the Arab workers in labor unions and coöperatives: they ought to do much more. Finally, can any happy society arise in Palestine, so long as the two races remain entirely isolated in education? Unless the lesson of coöperation and mutual understanding is learned at school, it is rarely learned in after life. This means, no doubt, that Jews must modify in some degree their Zionist nationalism. They must become patriots for the common Palestinian motherland. In it, and not merely in their own isolated settlements, they must strive to realize their social ideal. There can be no happy Jewish Home while an Arab slum surrounds it.

London. H. N. BRAILSFORD.

McReynolds, Roberts and Hughes

IN A PREVIOUS article,[1] the explanation by origins of the consistently conservative triad of Supreme Court Justices—Van Devanter, Sutherland and Butler—was found to be comparatively easy. All three of its members were seen to have come from a pioneering background of "rugged individualism" (Wyoming, Utah and Minnesota); two of them, Van Devanter and Butler, were originally railroad lawyers, and the third, Sutherland, was chiefly of note as a stand-pat Republican congressman; their decisions on the Supreme Court could have been accurately foreseen in the light of their avowedly laissez-faire political philosophy. Logic and group economic interest have coincided in their case as perfectly as with Alexander Hamilton, James Wilson or John Marshall.

Not so with the second conservative triad of Justices, Hughes, McReynolds and Roberts, all of whom were known as liberals and reformers before their appointment to the Court. Mr. Justice Hughes first rose to fame through his efficient investigation of the insurance evils in New York State; he was an early "Roosevelt Republican" of the days before the Progressive heresy. Mr. Justice McReynolds had been Attorney General in Woodrow Wilson's Cabinet and had long been concerned in the prosecution of sundry nefarious "Trusts." Mr. Justice Roberts, the youngest member of the Court—being, in fact, a mere youth of sixty-one—came into rather favorable public notice during the twenties through his handling of the oil cases arising out of the Teapot Dome scandals. All three had thus been identified with a considerable measure of government regulation of industry. Their subsequent conservatism, apparently violating their initial political approach, is hence much more interesting than the consistent but quite traditional conservatism of the first triad.

The career of Charles Evans Hughes is too well known to need elaborate recital. Born at Glens Falls, New York, April 11, 1862, the son of a Calvinist Baptist clergyman, he studied at Colgate College, Brown University and Columbia Law School. As professor and special lecturer at Cornell and at New York University between 1891 and 1900, he was in close touch with the liberal university thought of the time. During the same period, however, he was even more closely in touch with the attitude of a number of large New York corporations through his legal practice.

The latter began in 1884, when he became a clerk in the office of Chamberlain, Carter and Hornblower, a firm that handled much of the business of the New York Life Insurance Company, the New York Security and Trust Company and the New York Central Railroad. In 1888 Hughes married Carter's daughter, and the firm of Carter, Hughes and Cravath was formed, the junior member of which, Paul D. Cravath, who had been a fellow clerk with Hughes in Chamberlain, Carter and Hornblower, was destined later to become the chief counsel of Thomas F. Ryan, New York traction magnate of unsavory reputation, and still later, in the World War, was to become the trusted financial adviser of a number of the Allied governments.

During the eighties New York City was much concerned to find some effective means of forcing the telegraph and light companies to put their dangerous overhead wires underground. After several laws had been obtained, Mayor Grant in May, 1889, ordered the wires to be pulled down, but the Mount Morris Electric Light Company and the United States Illuminating Company obtained an injunction through Carter, Hughes and Cravath on the ground that the law under which Grant acted was "an invasion of the rights of property." The city appealed for a dissolution of the injunction and won its case before the Supreme Court of New York, which declared in its decision that the companies were "guilty of the willful violation of a manifest duty in allowing the wires to become dangerous" and that their claim of damage to property seemed to proceed "upon the assumption that nothing has a right to exist except themselves."

Hughes appeared personally in this case, as well as in one to obtain a franchise into New York City for the New York, Boston and Westchester Railway, suspected on good grounds of being a dummy for the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railway. In all this there was, of course, nothing discreditable in terms of accepted legal ethics; Hughes was simply, like any other good attorney, taking full

[1] "The Diehard Justices," The New Republic, June 17.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advantage for his clients of whatever technicalities the law permitted.

That he would be equally faithful and competent when his client happened to be the people instead of a corporation was shown by his efficient service as counsel for the Stevens Gas Commission, whose findings resulted in a 20-percent lowering of the gas rates for New York City, and still more by his work as counsel for the Armstrong insurance committee of the legislature in uncovering an enormous amount of insurance corruption. His election in 1906 as Governor of New York, a result of the popular acclaim that had greeted these investigations, was followed by two terms that were much less fruitful in economic reforms than had been expected. The insurance regulations, though excellent on paper, proved largely ineffectual in practice, and as usual in such cases only the petty offenders were brought to trial. But Governor Hughes had the perennial excuse of New York Governors, that of having a recalcitrant legislature on his hands.

Thus, his appointment to the Supreme Court in 1910 by President Taft was generally welcomed by liberal sentiment throughout the country, an attitude that seemed justified by the character of his decisions during the next six years. He supported laws limiting hours of labor for women and children and laws fixing minimum wages for women; he was disposed to emphasize the rights of the public in street-railway franchises; he agreed with the Court's reversal of its previous nullification of the Federal Employers' Liability Act, stating that "The law should be as zealous to protect the constitutional liberty of the employee as it is to guard that of the employer." He vainly sought to have the Court intervene to obtain a fair trial in Georgia for Leo Frank, whose conviction under mob pressure proved a prelude to his lynching. He dissented from the decision which held that the Food and Drug Act was not violated if a patent-medicine label misrepresented the curative properties of the bottle's contents, and he wrote the dissenting opinion in the famous case of Coppage v. Kansas, wherein the Court upheld the validity of "yellow dog" contracts. Had he continued on the Court at this time it is possible that he would have gone down in history along with Holmes and Brandeis as a great liberal Justice.

But his return to politics in 1916 as Republican candidate for the presidency, followed by fourteen years' renewed experience as a corporation lawyer, varied by a term as Secretary of State in Harding's Cabinet, subjected him to continued reactionary influence. As Secretary of State, his chief concern, aside from his leading part in the Washington Conference on limitation of armament, was in defending the interests of American capitalists in Mexico. In 1925 he was much criticized for requiring Count Michael Karolyi, exiled first President of Hungary, to pledge himself, before entering the United States, to make no political speeches. The reason for this apparently was that Karolyi, although a liberal and not a Communist, was *persona non grata* to the dictator of Hungary, Admiral Horthy. In his private practice as head of the firm of Hughes, Rounds, Schurman and Dwight, Hughes appeared before the Supreme Court on behalf of various large corporations, and he also acted as attorney for Senator Truman H. Newberry, who was convicted of spending $178,000 on his election where only $10,000 was permitted by the Corrupt Practices Act, but who escaped punishment and was allowed to take his seat in the Senate, owing to the Supreme Court's nullification of the section of the Act that applied to him.

Thus when Hughes was appointed Chief Justice by President Hoover in 1930, the popular reaction was totally different from what it had been in 1910. No less than twenty-six Senators opposed his election. They were led by Senator Borah, who at that time was less an admirer of the Supreme Court than he has since become. Senator Borah said:

> Bear in mind that at the present time coal and iron, oil and gas and power, light, transportation and transmission have all practically gone into the hands of a very few people. The great problem is, How shall the people of the United States be permitted to enjoy these natural resources and these means of transportation, free from extortion and oppression? I can conceive of no more vital question than this, which has long divided our Supreme Court. It has divided the Court not because one group of Justices is less or more conscientious in their views, but because of a wide divergence in viewpoint. I am deeply imbued with the wisdom and justice of the viewpoint of the minority. I do not want to strengthen the viewpoint of the majority.

More openly, the younger Senator La Follette exclaimed, "The President is loading down the federal judiciary with men whose economic viewpoint is that of the great aggregations of capital," and to the same effect Senator Norris said, "No man in public life so exemplifies the influence of powerful combinations in the political and financial world as Mr. Hughes."

The Chief Justice had hardly been in office a year before his opinions in four notable cases brought many liberals flocking back to his support. He wrote the decision demanding a fair trial for a convicted Negro in the District of Columbia and also those condemning as unconstitutional the Minnesota gag law and the California red-flag law, while he joined Justices Holmes, Brandeis and Stone in dissent in the case in which Douglas Mackintosh and Marie Bland were denied citizenship because they refused to promise to bear arms in a war if they should consider it unjust. But it should be noted that these were all civil-liberty cases. In those totally different and much more numerous cases involving the power of the government to control private corporations the Chief Justice has frequently stood where Senators Borah, Norris and La Follette prophesied he would stand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

James Clark McReynolds, son of a Kentucky plantation owner and physician and graduate of Vanderbilt University and the University of Virginia Law School, was until middle life a lawyer in Nashville, Tennessee, where he combined this vocation with that of a real-estate dealer. During 1893-95 he was secretary to Supreme Court Justice Howell E. Jackson, a corporation lawyer reputed to be the second richest man in Tennessee—it was said that he owed his Supreme Court appointment to the influence of the notorious New York boss, Tom Platt. In 1896 McReynolds ran unsuccessfully for Congress as a Gold Democrat, one of those who preferred to follow John M. Palmer in splitting the party and ensuring its defeat rather than endorse the radical program of William Jennings Bryan. In 1900 he added another role to his repertory by becoming a professor in Vanderbilt University, where he was especially noted for the heartening trait of extreme impatience with the dullards in his classes. At about this time he was also closely associated with the Reverend William Thomas Manning, rector of Christ Church (later bishop of New York), in a vigorous campaign to rid the town of gangsters and gamblers. Lawyer, business man, politician, teacher and moral reformer in a small Southern city—this was James Clark McReynolds during the first half of his varied and indeterminate career.

He was a close friend of Mr. Justice Harlan, the most liberal Supreme Court Justice of that period, and also of Judge Jacob M. Dickerson, later Secretary of War under Taft—Harlan came from Kentucky and Dickerson from Tennessee. Recommended by Dickerson to Attorney General Philander C. Knox, in 1903 he was appointed by the latter Assistant Attorney General, succeeding in that office the late James M. Beck. After four years in this none too liberal atmosphere, he took up private practice in New York City as a member of the firm of Cravath, Henderson and De Gersdorff, headed by the former partner of Hughes, Paul D. Cravath, but was soon recalled to Washington to assist in prosecuting the tobacco trust.

His language in this suit was liberal to the point of being almost incendiary. On one occasion he asked, with reference to the trust, "When has property illegally and criminally acquired come to have any rights?" and in summing up his argument, he said, "There are some of us who have hoped for a peaceful solution of this great question under the law as declared by the courts. But if in the light of the facts here presented this court shall decide that this defendant has not violated the law, then our hopes are a dream."

The speaker of these energetic words seemed the very man for Woodrow Wilson to appoint United States Attorney General. Yet perhaps one addicted to such refreshing bluntness of speech was hardly fitted for the delicate relationships of presidential Cabinets. Scornful of office seekers, Attorney General McReynolds offended Congressmen and Senators by being too busy to see them when they came to discuss matters of patronage. He quarreled so violently with Secretary McAdoo that neither department would consent to receive any communications from the other except through the President. Worst of all, he was soon at loggerheads with the newspapers through his refusal to press on with the Diggs-Caminetti "White Slave" case and thus furnish them with continuous copy.

That once celebrated case possessed certain features peculiarly embarrassing for Democratic politicians. Maury I. Diggs, former state architect of California, and Drew Caminetti, son of a man recently appointed Commissioner of Immigration by President Wilson, had taken a moral holiday from wives and families and gone to Reno, Nevada, accompanied by two high-school girls of Sacramento. Under a somewhat strained interpretation of the Mann Act, the episode came under the head of "White Slavery." Excitement ran high in California. The Hearst papers were especially shocked, and declaimed against "the almost incredible depravity of the Caminetti-Diggs case." And, of course, the Attorney General's delay was attributed to the political influence of Caminetti's father rather than to what was very likely a natural reluctance to stretch a statute aimed at commercialized vice considerably beyond its original intention.

Hard on the heels of this imbroglio came a quarrel with Senator Norris, who accused McReynolds of not intending to carry out a promise he had given to prosecute the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railway. In the course of an angry interview, the Attorney General ordered the Senator and ex-Governor Joseph Folk of Missouri to get out of his office.

Just at this time the death of Mr. Justice Lurton of the Supreme Court afforded President Wilson a golden opportunity to disembarrass himself of his embroiled Cabinet officer. At least, that was a current explanation of Attorney General McReynolds' appointment as Associate Justice in August, 1914. He went in as a Wilsonian liberal, but the character of his liberalism is sufficiently evident from an interview given out by him while he was Attorney General:

> I am opposed to a strict regimentation of business and likewise to the ownership of business by the government. Therefore, I am trying to help bring about free working conditions or competition in business. I am not hostile to wealth, nor to men who are doing business openly and fairly. Neither do I enthrone those men who have gained wealth by unjust practices. I want to see prices natural, and not unnatural—to see them fixed by the laws of trade, and not by combinations among the producers.

The logic of such naïve devotion to "the laws of trade" and to "competition in business" pointed backward to the eighties when McReynolds received his early education. Hence the transformation of the liberal into the reactionary was swift and easy.

In all the espionage cases Mr. Justice McReynolds

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

voted with the majority against Justices Holmes and Brandeis; so also in the first child-labor case, the O'Fallon case and the income-tax-exemption cases; he also voted against the Corrupt Practices Act, the second child-labor law and the District of Columbia minimum-wage law; he upheld, as against the majority, the California red-flag law and the Minnesota gag law, and he also dissented from the United Leather Workers decision, which declared strikes not to be conspiracies under the Sherman law, from the Scottsboro decision ordering a new trial, from the validation of the New Deal's gold policy, and finally, in solitary rebellion, from the recent T.V.A. decision. The liberal of 1914 has moved backward as the years moved forward until today he stands even to the right of the conservatives of 1914—Justices Van Devanter, Sutherland and Butler.

Owen Josephus Roberts is a product of the mid-Victorian city of Philadelphia, where he was born on May 2, 1875, where he grew up and where he attended the University of Pennsylvania for both his undergraduate and law courses. His scholastic record was so brilliant that in 1898, the very year in which he obtained his legal degree, he was appointed assistant professor of Law in the university, a position that he held until 1919. From 1901 to 1905 he was also first assistant district attorney of Philadelphia County. After the entrance of the United States into the World War, he was appointed special deputy attorney to represent the government in the prosecution of espionage cases in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Commending the appointment, The Christian Science Monitor observed, "Mr. Roberts has a high reputation as a vigorous, shrewd and tenacious lawyer, who is not likely to be deceived or wheedled into any policy of leniency." Later he represented the United States Housing Corporation in Philadelphia, and in 1920 became director of the City Trusts. In a speech delivered at the Waldorf-Astoria before the Trust Company Division of the American Bankers' Association on February 16, 1923, Mr. Roberts set forth his political philosophy. He first assailed the investigations of the Senate Judiciary Committee into the oil industry, which had given publicity to the $125,000 yearly salary paid Walter C. Teagle, president of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; this publicity, he said, was mere "propaganda" for the nationalization of the oil industry; the Standard Oil officials, he insisted, earned every dollar of their large salaries by giving the community increased production at decreased prices. Warming to his theme, he then asked a series of rhetorical questions:

> Are we prepared to revise our ideas of government? Are we prepared to go into a frank state of socialism in this country with all that it means in the suppression of ambition, in the deterrence of industry, in the holding back of men who want to arrange their affairs for their good and . . . then for the good of us all—are we to go into a state of socialism, or are you men and men like you prepared to get out, take off your coats and root for old-fashioned Anglo-Saxon individualism?

The bankers present indicating that they were not Socialists and that they were prepared to root, Mr. Roberts continued:

> Everywhere you turn judicial and semi-judicial administrative commissions, investigating bodies, inspectors of every known variety are found. The result is that the business man in America today feels that he is doing business with a minion of government looking over his shoulder with an upraised arm and a threatening scowl.

It will be admitted that the New Deal stood small chance of favorable consideration from a man who held these views as early as 1923.

When President Coolidge was finally forced by Senate insistence to prosecute the oil cases, he selected Mr. Roberts as the most fitting person he could think of to coöperate with ex-Senator Atlee Pomerene in conducting the prosecution. Senator Walsh of Montana, who had taken a leading part in the investigations that led up to the prosecutions but who was pointedly passed over by the President, asserted that he had never heard of Mr. Roberts before, and Senator Robert La Follette led a spirited but unsuccessful fight on the floor of the Senate against confirmation of the appointment.

Early in the case Mr. Roberts announced, "We will make haste, but we will make haste slowly." So true was this prognosis that the prosecution dragged on for six years, successful in recovering the government's stolen property but failing to convict any of the conspirators on criminal charges with the exception of ex-Secretary Fall. Considering the wealth and influence of the defendants, however, it is an open question whether any other prosecutor could have obtained a more favorable result. It would certainly not be fair to Mr. Roberts to hold him responsible for the moral insensitiveness of the juries which which he was confronted.

His nomination to the Supreme Court by President Hoover in June, 1930, was confirmed almost by default, the Senate liberals having been exhausted after their recent hard-won battle against the confirmation of Judge Parker. The general sentiment seemed to be that Mr. Justice Roberts was the best appointment that could be expected from President Hoover—which was quite possibly true. His record on the Court, nevertheless, has been about as conservative as that of Mr. Justice Hughes (their liberal moments, unfortunately, rarely coming at the same time), and he achieved the climax of inconsistency in the A.A.A. case of actually contradicting himself in successive paragraphs of the same decision.

One may in conclusion venture the unstartling prophecy that the three semi-liberal Justices, if one judges from their entire past, will henceforward be found in nine cases out of ten concurring with the three avowedly reactionary Justices.

ERNEST SUTHERLAND BATES.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Arkansas Flogging

EVERYONE will tell you that Negroes, particularly *Southern* Negroes, are a happy race. I was told by a well dressed citizen of Earle, Arkansas, in between licks of a heavy piece of mule's harness, that "We know how to handle our niggers. They are all right until you Northerners come down here and stir them up." WHIZZ! And another lick smarts against my hip.

On Monday, June 8, a meeting of sharecroppers in Earle, Crittenden County, Arkansas, was broken up by a mob of white planters and their henchmen. A number of Negroes and one white man were badly beaten. Frank Weems, about forty years old, Negro resident of Earle and a sharecropper, disappeared during the beatings and has not been seen since. There are some who say that they are sure he is dead. After my experience with men of the same caliber as his assailants (if not the same persons), who admitted to me that they could take me to him if they wanted to, and after watching their faces while one of them furiously lashed me, I am convinced that Weems was shown no mercy.

When the news came through that he was dead, a funeral was planned for Tuesday, June 16, at the Band Mill Church by his friends in the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union. It is not unusual to have a funeral service without the body of the mourned being present. The bodies of dead Negroes have a way of disappearing in the South. The Reverend Claude Williams, Presbyterian minister from Little Rock and a friend of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, was asked to preach the funeral service. He came into Memphis to the headquarters of the Union. It would be suicide for officials of the Union to have their offices in Arkansas in spite of the fact that the United States is, at least by constitution, a free country.

Then the rumor came that Weems was not dead. Mr. Williams decided to go to Earle to try to locate the widow and determine whether or not Weems was dead. Realizing that the Negroes would be terrified, it was decided that Mr. Williams, Roy Morelock and I would drive into Earle, Roy to get out and meet us half an hour later by the schoolhouse after he had located Mrs. Weems.

While we waited for Roy, a car drove up in which rode six well dressed white men. They got out and came over to us and asked us our business. It was apparent that they were looking for trouble, and that they were prepared to start it. We said we had come over to find out whether or not Weems was dead, because if he were not dead there would be no need for a funeral.

One man got in the back seat of Mr. Williams' car. A man stood on either running board. The others got into the car in which they had arrived. Mr. Williams was told to drive straight ahead. We went out Highway 75 until we came to two buildings, one looked like a warehouse, another like a ginning mill; we turned up a dirt road, crossed a wooden bridge over a ravine and drove around a soybean field. To the left was the overgrown bank of a river.

The six men surrounded us. They asked for the literature we had brought with us. We said we had no literature. They milled through Mr. Williams' suitcase, his briefcase, etc., and found a petition got out by the American Federation of Teachers.

"This is just a blind," they said. "We'll take you down the river and make you tell the truth."

Five men took Mr. Williams "down the river," one remained with me. I counted fourteen cracks of the mule's harness that one of them had driven farther up the dirt road to get. Then they came back. Mr. Williams was pale and shaken. Perspiration stood out on his face. He walked with difficulty.

"Now it's your turn," one of them said to me.

I could hardly believe what I had seen and heard, and I did not believe they would beat me. I repeated that they knew all I knew. But I was forced to go with them. One of them held the barbed wire apart, stepping down on the wire below, so that I wouldn't tear my dress as I crawled through. Branches of shrubbery were held back to save my stockings. We went downhill to a small clearing near the river's edge.

These men were cold sober. One asked me if I could swim. I said I could. "Swim across the river." I told him that they were ridiculous. Then they began to question me. They asked me my name. I asked them theirs: "John Doe," "Richard Roe," etc. Under such circumstances I considered that my name was none of their business. They wanted to know why I was there. I told them.

"We could take you to Frank Weems this minute if we wanted to," one of them said.

"If you could prove that he is alive that would make the funeral unnecessary and we could simply return home."

"Why are you interested in a nigger?"

"I have always believed that human life is sacred." Their laughter at this remark is one of the hideous experiences in my memory. Of course we know that planters consider *their* Negroes their property, to care for as they please, and to kill if they please.

The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union demands are: a ten-hour day, $1.50 for a ten-hour-day's labor, $2.50 for tractor drivers, right to collective bargaining, fair union contract, no discrimination against union members. A dollar and a half a day for seasonal work! Surely that is a modest demand.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Get down on the ground," one of the men said.

"I will not."

Then came the first crack. I think I laughed. Even then I could not believe it.

What crimes have been committed for the "Honor of Southern White Womanhood"! A Negro is lynched if any white woman can be found who will say "He attacked me." Is it womanhood they are protecting when they flogged me?

In the South we enjoy thinking our men folk chivalrous. Yet these were men I might meet at any of a number of my friends' homes. I looked them over again. "You can beat me unconscious, I haven't a chance," I said.

"Where were you born?"

"Memphis."

"You're a liar. We know who you are."

Whizz! Through the air came the harness and I felt it blaze upon my thigh. Then again.

"How many niggers have you kissed?" The man who asked that screwed up his eyes as he looked at me and grinned.

"I do not answer such questions."

I counted the men aloud. "One, two, three, four, five. My, but you're brave."

"Come on, let's go," one of them said.

A slender, tanned young man, with brown hair and eyes, dressed in neat white ducks and wearing a straw hat, did the whole whipping job on me. Four strokes in all. He didn't seem to mind it either. While the strap was lashing around me someone else would say, "Let her have it!" the same way men do at football or baseball games.

"I wouldn't have believed this," I said to them.

"You believe it now," one of them said, "and you'll stay out of Arkansas!"

Mr. Williams and his guard were waiting in the car. We were then forced to drive around, presumably to point out to them the man we were to meet. But Roy had been picked up before us and he had been beaten by Deputy Sheriff Peacher of Earle. He was in hiding until dark.

We slowed up as we came to the school and a young boy coming across the lawn, the only person near, saw us and asked if we were looking for someone. Later our brave Earle citizens considered that he might have been sent to warn us, so they made Mr. Williams drive back around and pick him up. Again we drove out Highway 75 to the turn-off near the scene of the flogging. But after questioning the youth they realized that he was just performing a neighborly act directing strangers.

I was then taken to the railroad station and put in charge of the station master, to be put on the 9:19 train.

Mr. Williams was kept by the gang. I could not help but think of him while waiting the hour and a half for the train. I expected his body to be found by the side of the road the next day. Later, when he phoned the union office the next day, we learned that he had been beaten several times more and had been forced to sign a statement that he had not been badly treated.

But I want to know:—if Frank Weems is living, as Sheriff Howard Curlin insists, why has he not been seen, and *why were we beaten when we went to see his wife to find out if he was alive?*

WILLIE SUE BLAGDEN.

Three Long Days

IT WAS Sunday morning in Woppington's leading news and tobacco shop and the proprietor, Elmer Durkin, was entertaining his old friend, J. T. Riland, the time-worn Republican editor.

"I see where your party has got itself a New Deal."

Elmer's smile robbed the repulsive term of its sting.

The clouds hung low over the town and Main Street was drenched with rain, but there was sunshine in the publisher's soul. His party had miraculously pulled itself together, he said. The factions had sunk their differences and united upon a strong ticket. The virile Westerners had put new hope into the Gloomy Old Party and J. T. Riland's heart was a garden of sunflowers.

"Not that the nomination of Landon was exactly a surprise."

"Everybody knew that was coming except the political experts," Elmer chuckled. "The press gang had me in stitches. Up to the last week their story was that the Block Legion would gang up on Alf and pin the tin on Vandenberg. Four years ago the same wise guys claimed that Chicago would sock Roosevelt in the puss and take Baker. At the showdown the boys couldn't even remember Newt's name."

"We newspaper men try to keep up the suspense."

"At that," said Elmer, "nobody guessed that all the other Holy Crusaders would be out on their feet before the opening gong. The Kawboys slipped over a fast one there. I bought tickets for a hot dog fight and the next thing I knew all the lads and lassies were singing Susannas."

That was party solidarity, the editor explained. In this crisis in the life of the Republic every candidate sacrificed personal ambition for the common good as soon as he saw that he was licked.

"When liberty and civilization are at stake—"

"Yes, I heard that one, J. T. You fellows are taking a dizzy chance betting our liberty and civilization on Landon and Knox. If you lose, we're on the spot."

"Under the American system," Mr. Riland said genially, "politicians are permitted a slight touch of exaggeration."

"The American system—for three long days I got that played on my old tin ears. Maybe Hoover thought he invented that nifty, but it was a whiskered gag back when Cleveland was in circulation. They said Grover was practically a Britisher because he liked free trade. Eight years ago the Old Guarders were handing the same raspberries to Herby himself because he had lived abroad. And of course Al Smith

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was just a yes-man for Rome. If you're running shy on arguments call the other guy a furriner. It always gets the suckers.

"I didn't listen to all the hate hymning, but every time I tuned in I got another order of the same. I thought Steiwer made a new low record for the course. He was the bird that started peddling the prattle that our troubles were only three years old. His keynote was so sour it blew the fuses and put all the gadgets on the fritz. His hunch was that he could poison-gas them into making him V.P. but that was the last time he was ever seen alive.

"Of course the big noise was Hoover, and did that old boy chuck his hate into the ring! I've got to admit that the Great Humanitarian hurls a better brand of harpoon than he used to and his call for a Holy Crusade was a wow. I guess the boys were a little ashamed because they didn't have the nerve to take another shot of Herbert and end it all, but anyway they gave him a swell hand as they eased him into the Great Beyond. For the first time in eight years the party has the Hoover out of its system and it's the dawn of a brighter day."

"Perhaps it is just as well," the journalist agreed. "He is a big man but not too lucky."

"When the great unseen audience hit the hay on Wednesday night it was all settled that the New Dealers were a gang of feather-brained bookworms, leeches, Bolshies, Neros and probably horse thieves. On the way home I was jittery about passing the post office because our Democratic p. m. would probably rush out and snitch my ticker. . . ." Elmer paused to light his pipe and the flare of the match revealed a face full of entertainment. "The dropping of the curtain indicates the passing of twenty hours—also of twenty noble leaders who had made the party what it is today, whatever that is. The joint is now under new management.

"Plenty of Grade D applesauce has been spilled about the Cleveland Revolution. George Norris says the same bosses are still running the works; the leopards have just got themselves a new set of spots. Certainly the old boys had their say in framing the platform. The fact remains that the hotel chambermaids found a lot of extinct statesmen when they swept up the cigar stubs.

"The platform turned out to be the usual mess of this-a and that-a. It spanked monopoly for Borah, there was a dash of Hearst, a hoo-hoo to Papa Coughlin and a little snifter of Doc Townsend's elixir. But this was the part that handed me a cackle. After damning the New Dealer and all his works for three long days, the convention turns around and swallows about all the Roosevelt policies the Nine Old Men have left alive. Of course we change the labels and our boys will run things more efficiently than the butter-fingered burglars now in charge. We'll give the farmers and the unemployed all the gravy they're getting now but we won't make them do anything to earn it. We'll slip the hungry their three squares, but the states must take over some of the bad news so the happy customers can pay it out of the other vest pocket. Cush for all, no boost in taxes and a balanced budget; when Alf stands on that plank, he'll get plenty of splinters in his dogs.

"The high-tariffers got their way and that puts the snoozer on the idea of baiting the trap for the sorehead Democrats. A protective tariff, a couple of warmed-over Bull Moosers running on a New Dealish platform with Young Turk sauce—where is that any place for a Jeffersonian to build his nest and rear his little ones?"

"The party," said Editor Riland, "decided to go after the progressives instead. There are more of them."

"Yes, those babies left home in 1932 and haven't even sent back a picture postcard. But while the Sunflower Boys are trying to lure them home to the fold they might lose the East. Organized labor got nothing at Cleveland but the gong."

"The Governor has shown a marked talent for compromise, for reconciling hostile interests."

Elmer found this idea pleasing.

"Honest Alf Landon," he said, "the difference-splitter."

FELIX RAY.

Suicide of a Dreamer

MR. EDGAR CHAMBLESS took his own life a few days ago in a furnished room on West Forty-ninth Street, New York City. After writing a polite note to the police telling them whom to notify, he turned on the gas, lay down on the bed and died, a shrunken little man who was sixty years old. Evidently he thought of himself as a failure, and in this verdict probably most of the people who had ever heard of him would concur. I had known him for seventeen years and in that time I had again and again wondered how he found the courage to keep going.

Mr. Chambless was the inventor of a new type of city, which he called "Roadtown." Most newspaper readers with retentive memories will recall that much about him, since he occasionally managed to get a reference to his plan into one paper or another. He was not just an impractical visionary; in many ways, his was an excellent scheme. Under it, towns would be very long and narrow, consisting in fact of one line of continuous building, passing through open fields, with rapid-transit facilities in the basement. He called it "a road traversing a single-line town, a community coördination of agriculture, industry, commerce, communications and the home—a line of improved city through the country, which integrates the technique of production, exchange and distribution." Such a town, he believed—and some competent engineers agreed with him—could be built for far less cost than our present type, and would be superior economically, functionally and esthetically.

He had been working on his idea for many years before I first met him, when he was forty-three but

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seemed ten or fifteen years older. I think I am right in saying that for several decades he did nothing but struggle to gain acceptance for his plan. He lived always in the most desperate poverty; there must have been many days when he went hungry. This was not because he was unable to earn a living at anything else; he had abilities that he might easily have turned to good account, but he preferred to follow this one bright-burning star. In the last seventeen years of his life, at least, I should say that he made no progress whatever.

My first contact with "the Roadtown man" was very much like all the successive ones. I was managing editor of a daily newspaper in New York and my office was, presumably, guarded by the usual array of secretaries, telephone operators and office boys. Nevertheless, he somehow managed to slip past them all and to enter my room unannounced, his hat in one hand and a great sheaf of blueprints, manuscripts and newspaper clippings in the other. Like all true fanatics, he assumed that anyone he approached was sure to be interested in his idea and had time enough to listen. As he talked, one mental bypath after another presented itself, and he followed every one. It needed a rather rude cross-examination to get him back to his central thesis and keep him on it until the main outlines of his thought were blocked in. I am ashamed to say that this and all my other interviews with him had to be terminated practically by main force on my part. I feel less guilty about this, however, because he bore me no grudge, but kept coming back, indomitably cheerful, always full of hope, always just on the verge of triumphant success.

It was really amazing how many people he managed to see and what numbers of them, some with well known names, consented to serve as sponsors for his plan. At one time he made a tremendous effort to interest the government of Soviet Russia, and received solid evidence that his ideas were at least being considered. His imagination soared to a whole series of Roadtowns all over European Russia and Siberia. But then as always, the cogs began to slip past each other, the clear perspective fogged, and presently hope was gone. For several years, his faith rested on great American business men, especially those, like John D. Rockefeller, Jr., of a philanthropic and experimental turn of mind. In this phase he would be faintly but definitely superior, when he came to tell me of his prospects. Sitting on the edge of his chair, in his clean, threadbare blue suit, his hat on his knees and his blueprints cascading to the floor, he would assure me that if I could but know the names of the important men whom he was now "contacting"—names of course confidential for the moment—I would realize how certain, how beyond doubt it was that in a few weeks a torrent of gold would be released to begin building Roadtown. With the advent of the New Deal and its Public Works Administration, Mr. Chambless' hopes naturally rose to the top of the thermometer. He spent much time in Washington waiting in anterooms and, I do not doubt, showering blueprints to be picked up by sympathetic lady secretaries, who always had a soft spot in their hearts for him. Just lately, he had worked with the committee that is planning the 1939 World's Fair in New York, trying to get them to turn it into a Roadtown of a special sort. I did not see him quite so often during these past few years, but when I did he always gave me to understand that now, at last, Roadtown had got over the top of the hill.

I hope I have made it clear that Mr. Chambless had no expectation of any personal gain from the fruition of his dreams. He might perhaps have looked for a modest stipend as consulting engineer for a year or two while the first Roadtown was under construction; but if so, it was only because he assumed as a matter of course that his advice would be needed. All his decades of unflagging, and sometimes skillful and effective, effort grew out of nothing more—and nothing less—than his conviction that this was the way towns ought to be and that, men being reasoning animals, if he explained it to enough of them, some day towns would be like this. It did not occur to him that even the best ideas do not get carried out unless they appeal to the immediate self-interest of somebody, or better still, some group. Although, as I have said, he formed advisory committees with impressive lists of names, he was from first to last a one-man band, never dreaming of any attempt to find a broad mass basis for his efforts, or to associate himself with others who are also trying to make a better world, but in a different way. He went quietly ahead, year after year, calling on busy men who did not very much want to see him, sitting on the edge of his chair, beaming earnestly through gold-rimmed eyeglasses, dropping blueprints in all directions.

And then, a few days ago, he came somehow to the end of his rope and knew it was the end. Sitting in his furnished room on West Forty-ninth Street, he must for some reason have decided to cast up his life accounts, and found a woeful deficit, in figures so large and so red that not the most incurable optimist could turn away from them, could convince himself by loud auto-enthusiasm that they were not there. And so he lay down and died without ever having seen a spadeful of earth turned over to make a single Roadtown anywhere in the world.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

Pity Ulysses

Pity Ulysses, fondly sure
His men exulted in their pure
Recovered shapes, and burned to think
What shame befell from Circe's drink.
Be glad he never did awaken
Nights when heroes, memory-shaken,
Sickened with longing for the sty,
The evil tusk, the leering eye.

VIRGINIA HAMILTON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Anti-Labor Employers Rally Round Landon—
Can the Republicans Win New York?
Farley Gets Some Contributions

IT IS becoming clear that the most pressing issue of the presidential campaign will be the drive of the Committee for Industrial Organization to unionize the workers in the mass industries. Whatever may be Governor Landon's precise views about unionization, he has accepted the support of leading anti-labor employers and must be counted as in the anti-labor camp. It is true that there are stout reactionaries among the nominal supporters of Mr. Roosevelt—for example, Vice President Garner—but on the whole the Roosevelt administration can be fairly called pro-labor. If it cannot be relied on actively to aid the C.I.O., at least it will not obstruct.

Faced with the certain prospect of the C.I.O.'s unionization drive, anti-labor employers are far less willing to compromise with Mr. Roosevelt than they were a few months ago. The extraordinary solidarity shown at the Republican convention in Cleveland has given them the first faint glimmering hope of beating him. Before Mr. Landon's nomination, big business commonly thought that the Republicans could not carry more than six states. Now there is a widespread belief that Mr. Landon has a chance of winning perhaps fifteen.

A great deal of serious figuring was done in Cleveland by the political advisers of big business. The fifteen states that the majority of them tentatively allot to the Republicans have 204 electoral votes. Two hundred and sixty-six are needed for election. In order to win, therefore, Mr. Landon must successfully invade territory now held by Mr. Roosevelt. According to report, Mr. John D. M. Hamilton and the other Landon managers have picked out eight additional states as potential objects of conquest—Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, South Dakota and West Virginia. New York, with forty-seven electoral votes, is much the most important. The seven other states, together, have only sixty-three electoral votes and while they theoretically could give Mr. Landon the election by a margin of one vote, this is far too risky a prospect to attract the big-business backers of the Republicans. They want to see the possibility of victory in New York before they spend money. If, as the campaign develops, they decide that Mr. Landon can take New York, apparently they will be ready to support him almost without limit; otherwise, they are likely to confine themselves to manipulating congressional elections.

On paper, Mr. Landon's chances of carrying New York seem infinitesimal. The 1935 registration figures show a Republican plurality up-state of 433,448, as against a Democratic plurality in New York City of 1,170,137. The most optimistic advisers of big business, as nearly as I can find out, do not believe that the Republican plurality up-state next November can possibly be more than 550,000. Within New York City, there is customarily a wide swing towards the Republican side in presidential elections. In 1932, Mr. Roosevelt's plurality over Mr. Hoover was only 871,120. Mr. Landon, to have a chance of winning, must better Mr. Hoover's vote in New York City by at least 160,000.

Apparently big business hopes that something can be done to influence the foreign-language blocs in New York City. In my opinion, however, if there is a possibility of Mr. Roosevelt's losing New York, it is not because of the money that big business may spend, or Mr. Lehman's refusal to run for Governor, or Mr. Al Smith's and Senator Copeland's hostility to the New Deal, but because of Mr. Roosevelt's persistent failure to conciliate Mayor LaGuardia and his following. By any definition, Mr. LaGuardia is as good a New Dealer as Mr. Roosevelt himself, and the two men ought to have been brother soldiers. Ever since he took office, however, Mr. Roosevelt has used federal patronage to rebuild what he and Mr. Farley insist is a new and reformed Tammany. The latest attempt of Mr. Roosevelt to renovate Tammany, it may be remarked, was to toss a newly created federal judgeship to a nominee of Mr. John J. Dooling, the not-so-new and not-so-reformed Tammany chieftain. It is generally believed that Mr. Roosevelt has promised to help Tammany defeat Mayor LaGuardia in the city elections next year, if, in return, Tammany gets out its full vote for Mr. Roosevelt.

At present, Mr. LaGuardia and his liberal, reformist supporters have great popular strength. Since the days of Boss Tweed, New York voters have been trained to associate graft and gangsterism with Tammany, and recently there have been uncovered two particularly flagrant examples of underworld rule—the Drukman murder in Brooklyn and the prostitution ring of Charles (Lucky Luciano) Lucania. It has not been shown that Tammany is responsible in either case, but the effect has been to revive suspicion of all machine politicians, and to enhance Mr. LaGuardia's prestige. It is altogether unlikely that Mr. Roosevelt can lose New York, especially since he now has the official support of the needle-trades unions. Nevertheless, I doubt if the supposedly smart politics he has been playing with Tammany has been so helpful as he thought.

Having started to criticize the administration's politics, I might as well be a thoroughgoing sour-puss and bring up the subject of "The Book of the Democratic Convention," now being sold for $2.50 a copy at the Philadelphia convention. Some of the companies advertising in this volume, and the amounts they have paid, are as follows: from the steel industry, U.S. Steel Corporation, $5,000; Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company, $2,500; Inland Steel Company, $1,000; from the rubber industry, B. F. Goodrich Company, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, $3,125 apiece; from the automobile industry, W. P. Chrysler, $7,500; Chevrolet Motor Company, $2,000. Steel, rubber and automobiles are the three industries that the C.I.O. hopes to unionize. By means of their advertisements in "The Book of the Democratic Convention," the employers in those industries are obviously trying to purchase the friendliness of the administration. There are many supporters of Mr. Roosevelt who think that he should not have any friendliness to sell them.

The official administration defense of "The Book of the Democratic Convention" is that Mr. Landon and the Republicans will receive corporation money in great chunks, and it behooves the Democrats to pick up whatever cor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poration small-change they can. There is an alternative, however, which is to run their campaign on the cheap. The Left parties in England and France refrain from taking contributions from the big-employer class, and if the Democrats wish to present themselves as a Left party, they should do likewise. At the moment, the members of the Democratic National Committee, with innumerable committee employees, are installed in the two most expensive hotels in Philadelphia, where a room costs $10 to $25 a night, and a cup of coffee 40 cents. It seems hard for Mr. Farley to believe that there are men and women who really believe in the New Deal and who, particularly if they were convinced of the Democratic Party's sincerity, would be willing to work for Mr. Roosevelt for little or nothing. Most of them would prefer, in fact, to have coffee at a nickel a cup than to have Mr. Farley take $5,000 from the U. S. Steel Corporation.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Wall Street Chases Its Tail—Magic Won't Hold up Prices—But Spending Gets Results

THE New York Stock Exchange is on the eve of a startling discovery—namely that the present high margins are restricting trade. "Trade," of course, means the buying and selling of securities and has nothing to do with trade in the proper sense of the term. The object of high margins is to restrict "trading" or speculation. And there are a good many people who think it would be an excellent thing to do away with margins altogether in order to restrict "trading" some more.

No one will accuse Senator Bulkley of Ohio of being a rabid Red. He is a distinguished lawyer in Ohio where his firm represents some of its most important business interests. When the S.E.C. act was before the Senate he introduced an amendment prohibiting margin trading entirely. And he got thirty-three votes for it and some of those who voted for the amendment were among the leading conservatives of the Senate. For instance, no one will call Carter Glass a Red. He is a right-wing Democrat, and the colleges have been falling over themselves for two years giving him degrees to testify to their high appraisal of his function as the guardian of sound finance in the nation. He voted for Senator Bulkley's amendment and, I believe, spoke for it. When, therefore, the Stock Exchange makes a study to see if high margins are restricting "trade"—meaning speculation in Wall Street—it can hardly hope that the results of this study will do it much service.

The stock-market break of April, this year, is now almost ancient history. So ancient, in fact, that it is almost completely forgotten. And the general public which does not play the market is hardly aware that the losses in the break of April are more than made up. I mean the losses in price, of course, and not the losses of those who bought high and sold low. The index of prices is now at the highest point since Mr. Roosevelt began to drive the money-changers out of the temple. The approach of the break in April was quite obvious. And the fact that the collapse in prices would very soon be repaired was also quite obvious. What will happen in the future is also fairly obvious.

In spite of all the yapping by Republican politicians, the large corporations and some smaller ones have been doing quite nicely under the magic of Mr. Roosevelt's regime. Most of those extraordinary measures by which Mr. Roosevelt was bringing order and plenty back to a bankrupt world have been destroyed. But the improvement goes on as surely as ever.

Imagine, if you can, a house which had been badly knocked about and which was leaning in various directions and at various angles. Suddenly a great builder—rehabilitator—gets busy and soon thereafter he exhibits the house, lifted well off the ground and with a whole set of new foundations under it. The master renovator points to the spectacle and croons to you about those magical foundations. Then suddenly along comes a gang of nine rowdies and knocks all the foundations from under the house. Of course you expect to see the house fall. But it doesn't. It not only remains apparently suspended in air, but actually rises several feet higher. You have to conclude that those spurious foundations had nothing to do with supporting the house; that some other force was holding it up and is raising it still higher.

Of course the thing that was producing Mr. Roosevelt's lift in business was and is his spending and nothing else. And it is this spending which has been making its way to the stock market. The relief burden hands out a billion. The billion goes into the hands of idle workers, who spend it for necessities. In a week or two after it is spent the entire sum is in the hands of merchants, wholesalers, jobbers, manufacturers, producers and their workers and stockholders, etc. In other words, the first move of the relief money is into the hands of the unemployed. The next move is into the hands of merchants. Thereafter it continues to move. But it moves in the channels of trade, pays wages of employed, not unemployed people.

But sooner or later, each dollar of this relief money comes into the hands of a fellow who decides to save it. He may save it in a sock. But that, doubtless, is rare. From that moment that dollar is available for investment. Where do you suppose all the billions spent in the first year of Roosevelt's administration are now? It is three years since the unemployed had their hands on it. It has been circulating around since, but being drained off dollar by dollar into the savings of workers, employers, financiers, stockholders, etc.

Of course, it is inevitable that these billions available for investment and created by government doles originally should have an effect on the stock market. And it has been this steady stream of funds into a market believed to be very low—this increase in the amount of investment funds without a corresponding increase in the amount of available investment—which has been pushing the market up. Of course as long as these funds continue to flood into the economic bloodstream from government spending, so long will the steady drain into the investment-fund pool continue. And this pressure will be accelerated by the waves of optimism that sweep over the country as the effect of government funds on the market is also duplicated in the field of business.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That upward pressure will always be marked by two phenomena. One is that it will push prices too high. The other is that this upward thrust will result in a periodic collapse of prices, after which the upward movement will be resumed as long as the flow of fresh funds either from government or private financing continues.

Now since the break last April, we have had the most extraordinary rush of funds and promise of new supplies from government sources that we have seen throughout the Roosevelt era. For the steady stream of government relief and recovery money has continued, while added to that was the promise of the bonus flood.

How high prices will go under this impact is difficult to say. But as there is no sign of any let-up in government spending, there is also no sign of any interruption in the expansion of investment funds. It is entirely possible, however, that the usual spectacle of upward moving prices will be carried too far and that a break may come before the election. Many think a break may be engineered to hurt Roosevelt. That is not so easy to do now. There probably will be a break but it is not likely to be any more serious than the one we had in April and it may well be quickly repaired. JOHN T. FLYNN.

The Bandwagon

Italy has earned by her sacrifices the respect of Europe and of all civilized and unprejudiced peoples of the world, while the poor Ethiopians have won freedom from slavery, cruel oppression, and ruthless exploitation.—*Dr. August Lascola, at an Italian Victory Dinner in Buffalo, quoted in The Buffalo Evening News.*

We regret to observe that Jewish clothing stores still believe they are permitted to give their mannikins in the show windows heads with Aryan features. We propose that all commercial and professional organizations of the Reich be vigilant and insist that from now on Jewish clothing stores provide their mannikins with heads having Semitic features.—*Der Stürmer, Nuremberg.*

The World War was one of the most American and most sacred actions ever entered upon by the United States. . . . Women love red-blooded men too much to say that they did not raise their sons to be cannon fodder. . . . I do not know where Princeton is.—*Representative John J. McSwain, chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, quoted in The Princeton Alumni Weekly.*

PLEASE MAY WE HAVE THREE GUESSES

League of Nations circles were reported to have been shocked by the disclosure that the International Red Cross had refused to send gas masks to Ethiopia during the Italian invasion. The Red Cross explained that it had refused the request of its Ethiopian branch because the application failed to specify the purpose for which the masks would be used.—*News item in The New York Times.*

OUR GET-TOGETHER-WITH-YOURSELVES DEPARTMENT

Herbert Hoover appeared and gave a shot to a withered arm. . . . He presented an authentic, intelligent and striking statement of the political philosophy for which he stands. . . . The occasion was in the real sense inspirational.—*Editorial in The New York World Telegram, discussing Mr. Hoover's Cleveland speech.*

The address which Herbert Hoover made to the Republican Convention was one of the most dangerous and vicious utterances ever made by a public man in this country before an open assembly. Under the thin disguise of defending "liberty," Herbert Clark Hoover gave aid and encouragement to every Kluxer, every Black Legionnaire and every Vigilante in America.—*Heywood Broun in The New York World Telegram.*

AND FLAGPOLE SITTERS' DECEASED WIVES' SISTERS?

Dr. Townsend said other forces are joining the movement ["to get rid of Roosevelt"] including [with his and Father Coughlin's forces] "all other dissatisfied persons in this country excepting radicals, but including EPIC supporters of Upton Sinclair, people who believe in the Bible, believe in God, cheer when the flag passes by, the Bible Belt solid Americans."—*The Pittsburgh Press.*

THE VOICE OF THE PROFIT: I. PARADISE LOST

The profit system was established by God. In 150 years, it brought America to its present state of greatness, and if the Brain Trust turns against it now, there is trouble ahead.—*The Reverend Arthur Mitchell, addressing a meeting of The American Women, Inc. Quoted in Social Frontier.*

II. PARADISE REGAINED

When the head of a tobacco company received a million dollars in salary and bonus, it was no more than his fair share of the profit won by his skill and shrewdness.—*Robert Quillen, in his syndicated column.*

WHOSE?

Some would-be social reformers are accustomed to discuss the relative merits of "producing for profit" and "producing for use." Implications of this phraseology are very misleading. . . . All production is for use.—*James O. McKinsey, chairman of Marshall Field and Company, in address to the Chicago Economic Club, quoted in The Chicago Daily News.*

SAVED BY THE GONG

"There ain't any need of sharing the wealth any more, the depression is gone."—*I. L. Young, former president of the Huey Long Share-the-Wealth Club in the Rodessa district of Louisiana, who has banked more than $38,000 since last July, when his land began to yield oil, quoted in an article in The Kansas City Star.*

ADD DEFINITIONS OF COMMUNISM: 4

"Communism," said the speaker, "amounts to a religion. Analyzed, its objectives are atheism, immorality and peace, except for red revolution."—*Dr. P. C. Traver, in a speech to the Reserve Officers' Association, South Bend, Indiana.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address the Bandwagon, care of The New Republic.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Farley and the Civil Service

SIR: Under the caption, "Farley Versus the Civil Service," Mr. Herbert O'Rourke in the May 27 issue of The New Republic undertakes to prove the falsity of "the charge of scuttling the merit system of selecting federal workers" which has been "among the counts that have been hastily scribbled in the bill of the indictment against the Roosevelt admistration." . . .

Mr. O'Rourke rightly commends the appointment to the Civil Service Commission of Dr. Leonard D. White. . . . It is not true, however, that "to make room for him on the Commission, Miss Jessie Dell, a Democrat from Georgia, was forced to resign." Neither does the circumstance of his Republicanism make his appointment noteworthy. The civil-service law requires that the Commission have no more than two members of any one political party. When Dr. White was appointed, there were already two Democratic members. . . .

Mr. O'Rourke attributes the "minor successes" that Mr. Farley achieved in finding places for "deserving Democrats" largely to a complete breakdown of the Civil Service Commission, due to the "vicious economy drive in the waning months of the Hoover administration"; and states that "from the summer of 1933 until the fall of 1934 it was virtually impossible to obtain suitable stenographers, typists or statistical clerks from the civil-service registers."

Strangely enough, it was during this period that layoffs in the regular departments were being made. This resulted in the displacement of several thousand employees of many years' service by newcomers from the outside, via either the political-preference or social-preference route. Were the former employees among the persons who, Mr. O'Rourke says, were "hopeless incompetents whom no sane administrator could be persuaded to hire"? . . .

Of the forty new agencies existing, twenty-six are not subject to the civil-service rules; and not all the positions in the others are subject thereto. The true picture is quite different from that painted by Mr. O'Rourke, when he names the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Farm Credit Administration, Federal Communications Commission, National Bituminous Coal Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Resettlement Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission, Social Security Board, Motor Carriers Bureau and Soil Conservation Service as "all subject to the civil-service Classification Act of 1923." It should be asked whether Mr. O'Rourke is aware that the Classification Act merely groups the federal service into salary grades, which has nothing to do with civil-service tests.

In this same paragraph, Mr. O'Rourke's statement that "in the aggregate these agencies account for a major fraction of the new workers that have been added to the federal payrolls," is something more than slightly inaccurate. Not only are the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Resettlement Administration (which account for 6,323 and 18,255 employees respectively) out of place in this list, since they are excepted from the civil-service law; but the nine other agencies named altogether have only about 14,000 employees. Since, on the authority of the Civil Service Commission, 241,533 employees were added to the federal payroll between February 28, 1933, and January 31, 1936, it is rather a puzzle to see how Mr. O'Rourke figures out his "major fraction of the new workers."

I endorse what Senator Norris says (as quoted in Mr. O'Rourke's article) about the management of the T.V.A. and the Rural Electrification Administration, which are excepted from the civil-Service act. It is a question, however, whether the Senator would be constrained to commend their employment systems so heartily had they been in different hands. Had the H.O.L.C. been placed under the control of Dr. Morgan and the T.V.A. under "Steamboat Bill" Stevenson, it is likely that Senator Norris would have been commending the former and denouncing the latter.

But more amusing and amazing is the story of the change in postmaster appointments brought about by President Roosevelt's executive order of July 12, 1933, which Mr. O'Rourke calls "an improvement over the old system," whereby "under previous administrations the first and second-class postmasterships were regarded as so many fat plums to be dished out by the Postmaster General."

Mr. O'Rourke seems unaware that the examination system for presidential postmasters was not inaugurated on July 12, 1933, but on March 31, 1917, by President Wilson. The Wilson order did go far to take politics out of the post office because it required the Post Office Department to appoint the first man on the eligible list established as the result of competitive examination by the Civil Service Commission. President Harding emasculated the order, however, by permitting the Department to pick any one of the first three, and his successors continued this practice. The Roosevelt order, far from being the great improvement that Mr. O'Rourke indicates, is actually a step backward. It specifically makes the incumbent postmaster, whose term of office has expired, as well as his subordinates in the service, ineligible. It stifles competition and practically ensures the appointment of the outsider hand-picked by the Postmaster General. It permits the Postmaster General to disqualify anyone who succeeds on the eligible list, *for any reason*—not, as formerly, for residence or character alone. In order to call this "an improvement over the old system" Mr. O'Rourke must go back to that "old system" which existed before 1917. The present system is far from being an improvement over any system followed during the past four administrations.

I believe Mr. O'Rourke is sound in his criticism of Lawrence Sullivan's charges that the scientific services of the government have been demoralized by the machinations of Mr. Farley and his myrmidons. Before seeking to extract the mote in Mr. Sullivan's eye, however, Mr. O'Rourke might do well to attend to the rather large beam in his own. . . . The federal civil service has probably not been so badly manhandled as some too ardent Republicans charge; but neither is the situation so reassuring as Mr. O'Rourke would have us believe.

H. ELIOT KAPLAN, Secretary,
New York City. National Civil Service Reform League.

SIR: In replying to Mr. Kaplan's gracious attack on my article, I am first of all constrained to agree that he is justified in his statement that the executive order of July 12, 1933, failed to remove the first and second-class postmasterships from politics. A recent check with the Civil Service Commission indicates that the spoils system is still rampant as far as these offices are concerned. There is really no satisfactory excuse for this blunder; I simply accepted the President's order at its face value and failed to detect the loopholes.

As for the remainder of the letter, Mr. Kaplan simply quibbles when he is not engaged in drawing gratuitous and false conclusions. To begin with, he is aware, of course, that of the eleven New Deal agencies I mentioned as being subject to the civil-service Classification Act of 1923, the employees of nine are selected on the basis of competitive examinations under the civil-service law. In stating that the New Deal agencies that are subject to civil-service rules accounted for a major fraction of the workers that have been added to federal payrolls, it did not occur to me that this would be interpreted as referring only to the agencies specifically mentioned. The agencies named were merely outstanding examples and the employees of other agencies that are subject to civil-service regulations as well as the collectors of cotton statistics and certain positions in Civilian Conservation Camps should be included before deciding whether or not these workers constitute a "major fraction" of the total. I admit an extraordinary statistical incapacity, but it seems to me that they do.

Although it is true that both the Resettlement Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration are not subject to civil-service regulations, it is true that they are subject to the Classification Act and that many of the workers employed by these agencies were recruited from the civil-service registers. In the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

early days of the A.A.A. particularly large numbers of the workers required were furnished by the Civil Service Commission. The same was true of many of the other new agencies that were not subject to civil-service regulations. As a matter of fact, in many offices a civil-service status was a much more valuable asset than political indorsement. Moreover, Mr. Kaplan is badly misinformed when he suggests that employees of many years' service were displaced by newcomers. There were layoffs in some of the old-line departments in 1933, but all workers who were worth their salt had no difficulty in locating another berth in one of the new agencies. Indeed, administrative officers were instructed to give preference to the victims of curtailment in the regular departments.

With respect to the appointment of Dr. Leonard D. White as one of the three Civil Service Commissioners, I certainly did not intend to imply that there was a direct displacement of Miss Dell by Dr. White. The fact is, however, that Miss Dell's resignation was requested soon after President Roosevelt was inaugurated and Dr. White was subsequently appointed to the Commission.

Washington, D. C. HERBERT O'ROURKE.

For Octavio Seigle

SIR: I deeply appreciate the beautiful words with which Bruce Bliven pays tribute to the life of our friend Dr. Octavio Seigle, in his splendid article entitled: "They Have Murdered My Friend," published in The New Republic of May 27. The murder of Octavio Seigle is one of the most horrible crimes that it is possible to imagine. For a comparable assassination, it is necessary to go back to the primitive ages of savage peoples. Everybody knows who killed him, and especially whose was the responsibility for his death, but it is impossible for the judges to practise justice in this case as well as in many others.

Miami Beach, Fla. DR. RAMON GRAU SAN MARTIN.

A Modern Dance Program

SIR: What's wrong with the modern dance? Why should a ballet dancer, on a modern-dance program, draw a burst of spontaneous applause which no modern dance drew? We refer to Valentinoff in the Men's Modern Dance Recital on March 15 at the Majestic Theatre. Why does the modern-dance audience still consist of devotees, the dancers coming to see their rivals, and the intellectuals? In spite of all the blare about the birth of a new modern-dance movement, the revitalizing of the dance, where is the layman? Not in the modern-dance audience.

We feel that the modern dance has become so intellectualized and obscure that it has lost all contact with reality, and as a result, with its potential audiences. We defy Martha Graham to tell us why she runs round the stage twice in "Pioneers" rather than once or three times. We defy Charles Weidman to tell us what is kinetic about his "Kinetic Pantomime." We defy the modern dancers or the modern-dance audience to relate these titles to the dances that accompany them, or for that matter explain the titles themselves: "Dithyrambic" and "Dance for Mænads" (Martha Graham); "Carefree and Earthbound" (Von Grona); "Rudepoema" and "Two Ecstatic Themes—Circular Descent and Pointed Ascent" (Doris Humphrey and Charles Wiedman).

We are a group of dancers with varying backgrounds and experience, interested in the future of the dance, who believe that if the modern dance is to become an important art form in present-day life, it must have the following program:

1. The complete dance must be intelligible not only to the performers, but to the audience as well, including the layman.
2. Every movement must have a significance of its own which is related to the dance as a whole.
3. All the mechanisms of the modern stage should be utilized to the utmost: (a) costumes should bear a definite relation to characterization; (b) scenery and lighting should be used as effectively as they are in the drama.
4. No single technique shall be used *per se*. Technique that is used must depend on the type of the dance and the theme presented.
5. No dance should be used to show off technique.
6. Solo dances should only be used as an integral part of a group dance.

We appeal to everyone interested in the future of the dance to communicate with us and help us build a real dance movement. Our address is 145 West Twenty-first Street, New York City.

GENE OLIVER,
New York City. The Dancers' Council.

P.P.S.

SIR: At the end of my second review of Edmund Wilson's "Travels in Two Democracies" ["Postscript to a Paragraph," The New Republic, June 10], I said that Wilson had studied Lenin's books "without understanding the sources of his strength or the dream for which he died." That is what I originally wrote, because it sounded good, and I suppose all critics have a weakness for phrases that sound good, but on proof I omitted the words "or the dream for which he died" because they sound too good to be true. There was a last-minute error in the proofreading department, and the correction was never made. Not until now.

New York City. MALCOLM COWLEY.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

We have received from John Collier, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, a communication describing the condition of the Navajos in northwestern New Mexico. Owing to the confusion of land titles in this area, a hodgepodge of fragments of public domain, allotments to the Indians, and land owned by the railroads, large ranchers and other interests, it has been impossible to establish a grazing district with regular boundaries for the Indians. It is also impossible to do soil-conservation work, which is badly needed. The Navajo Boundary Bill, which Mr. Collier believes would solve this situation, has been blocked in the Senate. Meanwhile the Indians are being slowly wiped out by a handful of white live-stock barons who practise systematic debauchery of these Indians with liquor in order to get them to sell their breeding stock and consequently lose the use of their land allotments. The Indian live-stock has shrunk from 100,000 to 37,000; tuberculosis is rampant among them; their average income has fallen to $130 a year for a family of five; and the infant death rate, due principally to malnutrition, is five times normal. It is impossible to guarantee that the situation will not result in physical violence.

The Prisoners' Relief Department of the International Labor Defense writes to call attention to the drive they are carrying on from June 1 to September 1 for funds to provide milk for the children of political prisoners serving long-term sentences. Their objective is to raise $3,000 for 250 children whose only regular family income is that provided by this department. All contributions should be sent them at Room 610, 80 East Eleventh Street, New York City.

The National Conference of Jews and Christians, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York City, "For Justice, Amity, Understanding and Coöperation among Catholics, Jews and Protestants in America," sends us an announcement of four institutes of human relations to be conducted this summer: at Blue Ridge, North Carolina, beginning June 20; Rocky Mountain National Park, beginning August 7; Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, beginning August 30; and Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Connecticut, beginning September 6.

What's on the Air?

Senator Hattie Caraway of Arkansas speaks on "Why Farm Women Are for the New Deal." Saturday, June 27, 9 to 9:30 A. M., N.B.C.-WJZ.

Presidential acceptance of nomination. President Roosevelt, Vice President Garner, Senator Barkley and Senator Robinson speak. Saturday, June 27, 9 to 11 P. M., N.B.C.-WJZ and WEAF networks.

Communist National Convention Program from Madison Square Garden, New York City. Speech of acceptance by nominee for President. Sunday, June 28, 5 to 6 P. M., N.B.C.-WJZ.

President Roosevelt addresses a gathering at Thomas Jefferson's home on Independence Day. Senator Carter Glass introduces him. Saturday, July 4, 11 to 11:30 A. M., N.B.C.-WEAF.

Dorothy Thompson is the guest speaker on the Woman's Radio Review, with the topic "Analysis of the News." Tuesday, July 7, 4 to 4:30 P. M., N.B.C.-WEAF.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Property as an Absolute

YOU TEND your livestock, you grow your crops, you cut your timber with husbandry, you raise your family, you erect appropriate structures for living and working. In all that, there is health, correctness, morality. Unfortunately, your circle of rights and obligations was not confined to these limits. There is a medium of exchange, for instance, a system of currency and credit, and a group arises to specialize in this medium. This financial group may be no wiser in its way than you were in yours. But its specialty gives it a grip upon the market. It may be closer to the "spirituality" of the courts and legislators. It may thereby work its will. And if there are many of you, acting somewhat independently of one another, the things you bring to market, for getting the money that pays your taxes and any goods you import, may impair your bargaining power. The financial group, working in connection with industrialists, may put through tariffs that raise the price on industrial goods, so that your unprotected market suffers in comparison. For a while you make up the differential by a mortgage. But as the disproportion persists, you are eventually unable to meet the mortgage, and lose your property. Irony: All your life you have managed conscientiously and well, you have produced in abundance—and as a reward, you are destitute.

The twenty-one writers in the new regionalist anthology of the Southern agrarians[1] have given us this picture with poignancy, brilliance and persuasive bitterness. Their attacks upon the financial manipulators who "own America" converge from many angles, in a collective enterprise that speaks well for writers averse to collective enterprise. But in noting that big business is developed by the growth of corporations, the agrarians would lump fascism and communism together as merely the extension of the corporate idea. Hence, they would draw upon our resistance to big business as a way of exhorting us against all collectives.

There is this to be said in their favor. Although Marxists like to foresee the "withering away of the state" (revealing here the effect of their "united front" with anarchists in the revolutionary struggles of the nineteenth century), it is hard to imagine how this withering away can take place. A complex social order, such as is required by industrial-agrarian collectivism, would necessarily require planning on a large scale. If we mean by the state the "bourgeois state," we can picture its atrophy. But if we mean by the state the legislative, educational and constabulary organization that assists the forces helping a given economic order and discourages the forces obstructing this order, we realize that a collective state is far from the anarchistic ideal. In fact, as others have pointed out, the anarchistic ideal is but the logical conclusion of the laissez-faire ideal. It is a heretical affirmation of the commercial orthodoxy.

Our agrarians may also be a heretical sect reaffirming orthodox commercial values. For they, like the commercialists, would extol property as an *absolute,* whereas the collectivists treat property as a *relationship.* The system of private ownership glorified by the agrarians was developed gradually with the rise of the commercial ethic. The merchant-landlords, aided by judicial interpretations, fought long and hard for the "right" to make property "alienable" (that is, to withdraw this means of production from communal use and reserve it exclusively for private exploitation.) After 1688, in the English Acts of Enclosure, judicial complicity in the development of these "rights" was reenforced by explicit legislation. Eventually the serf was "freed" and "mobile." The two-way relationship, whereby he was bound to his land and his use of the land was bound to him, had been dissolved. Many of the people thus "freed" died in abject poverty. Many migrated to the cities, where the new industries absorbed them. Many came to America, to dispossess the Indians and set up the same system of private ownership that had victimized them abroad.

It is unfortunate that the earlier feudal-collective usage of the word "property" has been obscured by later bourgeois usage. One used to speak, not of "having property," but of "having a property in" something. The earlier relativistic usage might have a modernized application by suggesting that the citizen of a collective state has a "property in" his citizenship, in the regularity of communicative or distributive resources, in any security afforded by the productive order, the political devices or the courts, in the marriage customs of his society, in the opportunities of study and enjoyment, etc. If he has a job and is performing that job with ability, he has a *property* in it in so far as the usages of his society help to keep him in possession of it and to guarantee him its rewards. Such thinking would suggest that property is as present in a communist state as in a commercial state. The question then becomes, not "Is there property?" but "What kind of property is there?" Every state is a property state.

But by treating property as an absolute, rather than as a relationship, the agrarians enjoy a one-way conception of property rights. When things are going well, their ideal private farmer, proud and free in the untrammeled possession of his acres, dismisses the government with dignity. He does as he pleases, without "interference": if the market is favorable, he sells; if unfavorable, he retains for his own use. No necessities can dispossess him, since his land is inalienable. The land is "bound to" him, though he presumably is not "bound to" it (which would entail immobilization, hence a feudal impairment of freedom). Perhaps the land is even untaxed, as the logic of the agrarians' position would require, since the farmer must be wholly independent of the market's financial compulsion, otherwise the deterministic genius of the "money crop" may get him. On the other hand, if there are adversities, the government must be called in. Such matters as flood control, drought relief, education, road building and medication are to be handled with governmental assistance. The project suggests a "spoiled child" theory of politics, where the papa-government is dismissed by the proud bearers of "freedom" as intolerable interference, until it must be called on for help.

Once we introduce a two-way conception of rights, noting an *ambivalent* situation wherein "rights" are interwoven with *obligations,* and vice versa, the proposal appears less realistic. But though the agrarians neglect the ambivalent feature when advocating their own cause, they remember it when warning against collectivism (since they note that collectivist security requires central planning, and central

[1] Who Owns America? A New Declaration of Independence, edited by Herbert Agar and Allen Tate. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 352 pages. $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planning necessarily restricts private arbitrary choice). We may note a strong sense of reciprocity in our earlier revolutionary slogan, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." The slogan implicit in the agrarians' one-way revolutionary theory would seem to be, "Representation without taxation is liberty." One can question whether freedom, as so conceived, meets the needs of the modern economic order. But one must admit that it would be fun.

Those who consider social welfare as a *human* problem, rather than a *class* problem, may be disturbed that there is not so much as a single paragraph devoted to the Negro question. Particularly when one author suggests that some are endowed by natural quality to rule, and others are endowed to be hired. A property state such as they propose would fix a disproportion between owners and dispossessed. These writers emphatically reject the slovenly way in which finance capitalism has divided the class of those fit to rule from the class of those fit to be ruled, yet they offer no explicit Binet test as an alternative for disclosing the radical difference in quality. Nor do they tell us whether the estates will be held intact by primogeniture, or whether some sons and daughters of the owners must also in time shift to the class of dispossessed, with attendant disadvantages in bargaining power.

As one writer observes, the regionalists refer often to the past, while the "proletarian" school of social criticism has its eyes upon the future. Yet it is the *proletarians* who talk always with reference to the great laboratory of history. The agrarians are almost vandalistic in their destruction of historic lore by omission. There may be good reason for this. History shows us, again and again, how private ownership of the productive plant operates to turn possession into dispossession. Such training in ambivalence were best dismissed by these advocates as "determinism." The "distributist" state could be maintained only by periodic redistribution. No wonder the master of the agrarians, Jefferson, who pleaded for the private ownership of productive plant, also suggested as a corollary that we should need a revolution every twenty years.

KENNETH BURKE.

Friend of the Apaches

Apache Agent: The Story of John P. Clum, by Woodworth Clum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 312 pages. $3.

FROM THE year 1837 to the year 1886, white men's governments spent more than twenty million dollars and several thousand lives in mishandling the Apache Indians. The record began with an unofficial massacre of the Mimbrieno Apaches at the copper mines of Santa Rita del Cobre. It ended September 4, 1886, when Geronimo met General Nelson A. Miles under a flag of truce and was seized and transported to Florida. Within this period there fell one happy time, 1874-77. The great majority of all of the Apaches, band by band, were peacefully assembled at San Carlos, Arizona; they were settled into the arts of peace; they were governed without any terrorism, practically through the mediation of their own chiefs and their own police. Their superintendent was a mere boy. John P. Clum took charge of the Apaches at the age of twenty-three, and he removed himself from government employ at the age of twenty-six. Clum's last official action of importance was to capture, without treachery and without bloodshed, the famous, or infamous, Geronimo.

Before Clum took charge of the Apaches, the government's policy had been that of extermination. From ten to twenty Mexicans or Nordic Americans were exterminated for each Apache. Indeed, the Apaches multiplied while they were being exterminated. But also their hatred of white men increased. It was the essence of Clum's work that he excluded the military from the situation. His final offense was the bloodless capture of Geronimo. The immediate retaliation was a reappearance of the army at San Carlos. Thereupon, Clum resigned without argument. Within a fortnight, Geronimo had been released from the blockhouse. Then followed a period of mixed civil and military rule, with scandals and human outrages that multiplied year by year. In 1882, the Federal Grand Jury of Arizona reported:

> Never until present investigations . . . laid bare the infamy . . . could a proper idea be formed of the fraud and felony [at San Carlos]. . . . In the meantime the Indians are neglected, half-fed, discontented and turbulent.

So Geronimo took the warpath once more, and with forces varying from 20 to 100 warriors, he sometimes eluded, sometimes defeated, 3,000 and, later, 5,000 troops across four years. Ultimately his band was decimated, not by the army but by the Apache scouts. Only Apaches were of avail in fighting Apaches.

"Apache Agent" is not a satisfactory book. Its first hundred pages are devoted to an unclear narrative of the Apache wars preceding Clum's superintendency. The succeeding chapters are readable chiefly in those pages which are direct quotations from Clum. They enrich somewhat, but not greatly, Clum's printed reports made during his years with the Apaches. The book, wherever Clum's own words are not used, suffers from impressionistic statement.

Two questions are raised in the reader's mind. Was Clum a great Indian agent? There is no doubt that he was. Clum had audacity and wisdom, astounding in a youngster. In these "murderous savages," as they were all but universally viewed in 1874, Clum saw, in his first fortnight of contact, not only the possibilities of settled industry but of "culture" as distinct from, or in addition to, "civilization" (his words). His intuition proved itself through achievement; in three years he healed the wounds of forty years. With a minimum of intelligent outside backing, Clum undoubtedly would have stayed at his job and would have averted the shames and horrors of the years 1880-86.

The other question relates to Geronimo, about whom a great many books have been written. The present one sheds no new light and is, in fact, an unworthy treatment of the subject. Geronimo started life as an Apache distinguished by friendliness to the whites, and by pacifistic traits. His young wife, his three children and his mother were all slaughtered together by Mexicans at Casas Grandes in Chihuahua, in 1858. Thereafter, Geronimo fought the white man. However, from time to time Geronimo did settle down, and he was a capable farmer. True, he killed white women and children. But Mexicans and whites alike killed the Apache women and children. That was how the war was fought. Geronimo's final and famous enterprise arose directly out of the scandalous abuses at San Carlos, which followed the retirement of Clum. As a campaigner, Geronimo was not more resourceful than a number of the Apache leaders who had gone before him. But the four years' spectacle of a hundred Indians holding at bay 5,000 white troops gained military acclaim for Geronimo, and Geronimo's ride down Pennsylvania Avenue in the inauguration parade of Theodore Roosevelt, on March 4, 1905, was cheered by a million onlookers.

JOHN COLLIER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Knowledge of Necessity

A Time to Dance; Noah and the Waters and Other Poems; with an Essay, Revolution in Writing, by C. Day Lewis. New York: Random House. 145 pages. $1.75.

OTHER young writers, on both sides of the Atlantic, who share Day Lewis' political sympathies with the Left, may be more remarkable in some respects than he, but I think that none of them succeeds in expressing more plainly or more finely than he does the philosophic and moral implications of that position. Less than ten years ago it would have seemed incredible that an English or American poet would think or feel, before generations had elapsed, as Day Lewis already does. Was it only yesterday that the most gifted and the most candid poets were shuddering with revulsion when they regarded the human race, their mainly disgusting fellow creatures?—such is the question in one's mind as one reads, for example, in this volume, Noah's speech to the horrified burghers who gaze at the flooding waters that symbolize the masses:

> You looked upon these waters as an element
> Necessary, subordinate, unfeatured,
> God-given to be your scavengers, to ripen
> Your crops and carry you to outlandish pleasures:
> Their lives the head of steam that kept you running.
> To me they look like men—more men than you.

The sense of human dignity, which seemed irrevocably lost in the midst of "hollow men" and "immortal liars," has reappeared in English verse, and with it has come a break out of that lethal solipsism in which it seemed that the literary spirit was hopelessly imprisoned. Kinship, if we are to judge from Day Lewis, has become again, as it has always been in the great periods, a basic reality for the man of letters; and the soliloquy, in his work, has been superseded by the summons, the exhortation, the direct address.

It is part of the same transformation that the material world, the majestic physical processes, should reassume the actuality they once had for poets; should now take on, in fact, a solidity and a beauty for the imagination which they could never quite have had until the minds of men, as in the last centuries, had been disciplined to a severe naturalism. The corrupt mysticisms that have enfeebled so much modern poetry have had no hand, apparently, in the formation of Day Lewis' thought: he speaks as a man who is at home in nature. When the Seven Deadly Sins passed in a spectacle before Spenser's Red Cross Knight, they appeared as a wolf, a swine, a lion, and the like; now, when the Virtues pass before Day Lewis' Noah, it is also *"in the guise of animals,"* and the "two voices" counsel him not to despise but to emulate the patience of the mole, the courage of the salmon and the curiosity of the monkey. The new imagery will seem grotesque only to incurable transcendentalists.

If physical law is a reality and not an illusion to this poet, the effect is not to plunge him into the swamp of dejection and self-pity in which his best predecessors have wallowed: on the contrary, it is only to teach him what liberty really consists in for human beings; and he quotes not Gautama the Buddha but Friedrich Engels:

> *Freedom is knowledge of necessity:*
> It is using the currents of air to waft your wings
> And adverse ranges for test of climbing-speed;
> It is learning from drift how aim should be corrected,
> And from emergency the extreme course;
> Here flight is trimmed to meet capricious weather
> And shaped by all elements shall master them.

Uninhibited by the romantic view of Marxist determinism, Day Lewis celebrates the will with a boldness with which it has not been celebrated by two or three generations of idealist or mystical poets: the long passage in "A Time to Dance" which narrates the adventurous flight of Parer and M'Intosh from England to Australia, is a sustained and eager tribute to "The spirit of life that nothing can keep down." It is not with a whimper that Day Lewis sees the world ending: on the contrary, he has helped to bring back to poetry the affirmativeness it had so long forgotten, and even the death of a young friend—the subject of another passage in "A Time to Dance"—becomes for him a stimulus not to fruitless mourning but to fresh resolutions:

> Lay laurels here, and leave your tears to dry—
> Sirs, his last wishes were that you should laugh.

NEWTON ARVIN.

The Ace of Tough Reporters

Europe under the Terror, by John L. Spivak. New York: Simon and Schuster. 251 pages. $2.50.

MR. SPIVAK has impudence and a social conscience. He is also an artist. The publishers quote my previous statement, that "he is America's greatest newspaper man; the journalistic woods are full of fancy writers and the police courts of the country swarm with tough eggs who hatch into sensational reporters, but there are very few swell writers who are also tough reporters, and Spivak is the ace among them." I would now like to add that, without qualifications of branch or field, Mr. Spivak is a swell writer.

He has brought back from Europe a picture of almost unbelievable economic disintegration, with the populations of some countries "being ground down to living conditions only a step removed from those of coolies." He found crushed and oppressed people cautiously organizing, rulers "squatting like huge birds of prey, watching with hawklike sharpness lest their property and power be destroyed by the hungry millions." But the book is not an enlargement or even a historical interpretation of these stirring and tragically sensational statements. It is primarily the answer to the question: What does dictatorship mean to me, the individual, the common man? The answer is given dramatically, tensely, in sketches that are at times relieved with deep humor, ironic and bitter; there are a series of episodes, even adventures—but adventures with a social conscience—narratives of trips to the underground plotters, visits to the lower depths, and at the end you have not only the facts and the interpretation but you really see, you really experience, you really live through a few hours of the lives of several hundred million people under Fascist terror. And at times characters emerge in tragic Gorky manner, and frequently the picture is painted in the first Van Gogh, "The Potato Eaters," period. To the criticism that Mr. Spivak seems to take liberties with his material, the answer is, so does every artist.

Any journalist, if he is honest and not cowed by a dictator, will cable the fact that the standard of living has gone down another notch, but he does not take us into the homes of men and women (as in Brzeziny, Poland) who sit at their sewing machines eighteen hours a day, spitting their lungs out, nor does he find us the peasant splitting matches in four, telling of the great day he saw a real orange on the plate of a rich man, nor does he let us hear a poor man's cry for a little salt to make the daily potatoes palatable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And when it comes to officialdom, the conventional journalist dare not ask embarrassing questions and Mr. Spivak asks nothing else.

Almost any newspaperman will risk his life for a story, but few will risk their pay checks. There are several hundred correspondents *in partibus infidelium,* and leaving out the small minority of——(supply whatever word you think best, from "misguided" to "crooks") who are bribed by money, ribbons of honor, handshakes of dictators, etc., the majority must devote a large part of their honest lives to laying pipe lines, building up sources, fixing things up with officials, always arranging everything for permanent flow of news, in the knowledge that (a) to ensure this they must place themselves under obligation to bureaucrats and (b) that they must remain on good terms with the dictators and regimes of the country where they are at work, and therefore they are never at liberty to write as they please.

The way to break this stranglehold on the press therefore is either to write under a false name, as Bolitho did, or to tell the truth and shame the devil, as Dorothy Thompson did with Hitler, and Mr. Spivak is now doing with five countries. Miss Thompson will not return to Germany and Mr. John Gunther will stay out also, and if Mr. Spivak goes back under his own name he will be beaten black and blue by the Fascists of all countries. Hit and Run—that is the formula for honest reporting in terroristic lands. Mr. Spivak hits hard. And his book is a home run.

GEORGE SELDES.

The Kentucky Hills

Head o' W-Hollow, by Jesse Stuart. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

CORRESPONDENCE-COURSE advertisements and journalistic-school precepts have done much to dispel an old-fashioned notion that story writers are born that way. You too can write! But when a natural-born story-teller like Jesse Stuart comes along it is not hard to tell the real thing from the product of ten easy lessons.

Of course it is hard to judge now whether this Kentucky mountain boy is just playing by ear, and playing well, or whether he has the makings of a master. It will be easier to tell about that when he begins to try his hand at program pieces instead of a few mountain tunes he has picked up round home. One thing seems obvious, though—no one was ever taught from scratch to write so well.

There are nineteen short stories in his first collection and their average of excellence is much higher than that of any "best short story" anthology I have ever read. Maybe this is dubious praise. Actually there is not a weak story in the lot. Most short-story writers, even if they are good, like to interlard a collection with a few sorry stories, just to make the good stories seem better. If Jesse Stuart has done so, it can't be told.

This is not to say that all is perfection here. One of his worst faults is that of getting bad poetry mixed up with first-rate prose. There is scarcely a page on which he does not strain at a metaphor and swallow a pleonasm. Mountain people do have some curiously poetic-archaic expressions, but they don't talk like Edmund Spenser and Percy Mackaye every time they open their heads.

There are two painfully self-conscious pieces at the beginning and end of the book which tell nothing that the stories do not and which are pompously out of kilter with the high humor that blows through the stories. I suppose these end pieces are a concession to the fabled book-buyer's prejudice against short-story collections—are meant, that is, to lend the book the appearance of a novel. Indeed there is a certain continuity to the stories, inasmuch as the characters are all Kentucky hill people and the setting, with one exception, is the same throughout. But there is not one American novel in a hundred that can come up to "Head o' W-Hollow."

GEORGE MILBURN.

Czech Statesmen

Defender of Democracy: Masaryk of Czechoslovakia, by Emil Ludwig. New York: Robert M. McBride. 278 pages. $3.

President Masaryk Tells His Story, by Karel Capek. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 302 pages. $2.50.

Benes, Statesman of Central Europe, by Pierre Crabites. New York: Coward-McCann. 294 pages. $3.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA and Central Europe, as they emerge from the World War, owe their present shape to a great extent to two Czech statesmen who have worked together since the beginning of the World War for the realization of their national ideal. Masaryk, the philosopher, was President of Czechoslovakia from 1918 until he retired last year at the age of eighty-six, and was succeeded by Benes, a former student of his.

Czechoslovakia's task in 1919 was not easy. The country included about four million Germans and Hungarians, who did not belong to it according to principles of national self-determination, and who lived along the frontiers in a close contiguity with their co-nationals on the other side. The treatment of those minorities was neither wise nor magnanimous. Perhaps it would have been too much to expect it. The end of the World War had brought a complete reversal of the policy which since about 800 A.D. had pushed forward the Germans east of the Elbe and along the Danube, at the expense of the Slav population, about the same time that the Magyars created their rule in Hungary, also at the expense of the Slavs. Up to the World War, Slav minorities had lived within Prussia, Austria and Hungary. In 1918 Czechoslovakia and Poland were reconstructed, and Germans and Hungarians lived now as minorities in countries ruled by Slavs. The memories of history were too strong to allow of any ideal or perfect solution. The oppressed of yesterday easily became the oppressors of today.

In the midst of those difficulties created by history Masaryk and Benes have tried with a rare success and ability to arrive at a working compromise between an ideal humanism and the frailties of a militant nationalism. During his whole career as a political teacher Masaryk had always been a realist in the best sense of the word. He had turned the eyes of his co-nationals from a romantic admiration of Panslav Russia to the Western democracies, especially the Anglo-Saxon. He understood the great importance of truth and moral principles in political life. He had never courted cheap popularity or the acclaim of the masses. By hard and honest intellectual work during a lifetime, he had prepared himself for the political task that history and his nationalistic conscience put before him at an age when other men retire from public life. His government may be open to criticism in the difficult questions of the treatment of the German minority and of the non-fulfilment of the promises of autonomy to the Slovaks and Ruthenians. Still the record of Czechoslovakia under Masaryk and Benes is better than that of any other Central or Southeastern European state after the World War.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Czechoslovakia is probably the only one of the post-war states that inspires confidence. There are no sudden surprises, no violent inner conflicts. Its foreign policy is not like that of Poland under Pilsudski and Beck. Benes will continue to guide the state in the spirit of his teacher. The aggressive self-assertion of the German nationalistic spirit under Hitler, the reawakened memories of Germany's former eastward expansion, threaten to reopen the age-old conflict between Germans and Slavs. The "eastern problem" may in the long run turn out to be even more important than the problem of the Rhine.

There are few good books in the English language on the Slav-German problems and their background. The two on Masaryk and the one on Benes do not pretend to fill the gap. Both Masaryk books are reports of his talks and of conversations with him. Naturally they are too little critical to be of real value to the historian, and they do not succeed in giving an integrated picture of Masaryk's personality. The book on Benes has much less of a personal character; Crabites looks upon Benes "as the personification of peace" and as "Central Europe's soundest statesman." The first seems exaggerated, the second is probably true. The book by Crabites will be found useful by all interested in European affairs, but it does not contain much new information for the serious student of Czechoslovakia.

HANS KOHN.

Condensation

The Cambridge Shorter History of India, by J. Allan, Sir T. Wolseley Haig and H. H. Dodwell. New York: The Macmillan Company. 970 pages, with 20 maps. $4.

A SUCCESSFUL condensation of "The Cambridge History of India," this book is divided into three sections, each written by an authority in the field—Ancient India, Moslem India and British India. It is superior to "The Oxford History of India," the best previous one-volume history. The section on ancient India is rid of the fantastic Aryan bias common to European works which tended to credit everything valuable in Indian civilization to Nordic invaders—a notion that has been rendered absurd by recent archeological discoveries at Harrapa and Mohenjo Daro.

The middle section, on Moslem India, is too exclusively a dynastic and military history. We are given almost no sense of the effect of the Moslem invasions upon the civilization of India, upon its economic life and social institutions. Religion gets an occasional, reverential glance; but from a study of this section the reader would leave the pages without any awareness that a remarkable art and a notable literature were among the products of Mohammedan rule. Instead the author lays his emphasis on degenerate kings and unremitting warfare as if he wished to prepare a dark background for the rising glory of the Pax Britannica.

The writing is clear throughout, and the authors of the three sections observe the good traditions of academic history. Toward the end, however, the appearance of pure objectivity is often dropped—as, for example, in this piece of oblique malice: "But advanced Indian opinion was from the first hostile to him [Mr. Lionel Curtis, proponent of the Round Table Conference], perhaps owing to his South African association, perhaps also because it was reluctant to defend itself in an arena where rhetoric and invective would be idle weapons."

ISIDOR SCHNEIDER.

Books in Brief

General Smuts, Volume I, by Sarah Gertrude Millin. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 375 pages. $3.50.

IT WAS in 1916 that England discovered Smuts the Afrikander, who was then commander in chief of the British imperial forces in German East Africa. The discovery was "a British romance and the greatest possible tribute to Britain. . . . It made the British feel they could not be a bad and undeserving nation since they had it in them so to win over an honest enemy." To this feeling and to the unlimited powers of ballyhoo at the service of British imperialism, the reputation since achieved by General Smuts seems to be due in large measure. It is difficult to account in any other way for the glorification of a man as hero, statesman and profound thinker who was actually a more or less astute politician, a courageous, callous and very fortunate soldier, the champion of "a white South Africa," the utterly ungenerous opponent of Gandhi in his struggle for the rights of Indians living in Africa, the implacable and—on occasion—unscrupulous enemy of labor. The facts behind this extraordinary build-up emerge in Mrs. Millin's candid and well documented biography, though she sometimes seems not fully to appreciate their significance. This first volume takes Smuts from his birth in 1870 to membership in the Imperial War Cabinet in 1921. It has the slick competence that characterizes all of Mrs. Millin's writings about Africa. M. G.

Antoine Lavoisier: The Father of Modern Chemistry, by Douglas McKie. With an Introduction by F. G. Donnan. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 303 pages, illustrated. $2.50.

Antoine Laurent Lavoisier (born 1743) inaugurated one of the major revolutions in science, and was cruelly done to death by fanatics of a great political revolution—one of whom is reputed to have said, "The Republic has no need of scientists: let Justice take her course." Of this remarkable man Douglas McKie has written a sensitive and painstaking biography, in the course of which we meet many of the greatest intellectual figures of the eighteenth century, whose struggles for—and against—the liberating forces of science as represented by Lavoisier constitute one of the permanently significant dramas of human history. Dr. McKie gives an exceptionally full and detailed account of the actual researches by which Lavoisier established the facts regarding combustion: we see here the beginnings of that extraordinarily patient, minute and tireless investigation of phenomena which is the basis of scientific method, and to which Lavoisier brought also the genius for synthesizing discoveries that ranks him, as a creative scientist, with Galileo, Darwin, Mendel and Pasteur. An oddly modern note is sounded when we learn that Lavoisier was very active in the development of the early gunpowder industry of France: the very origin of modern chemistry, it seems, was linked to the munitions makers. H. W.

Shadows Flying, by John Evans. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.50.

In his second novel John Evans is concerned with a group of characters whose aberrations Eugene O'Neill might portray on the stage or Robinson Jeffers suggest in one of his epic poems; they seem more than a little strained in prose fiction. Jacob, the central figure, is a hypersensi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive young man whose childhood and youth were made miserable by his latent homosexual tendencies. The book covers the three weeks of Jacob's visit to David Runyon, an older and stronger man, at Runyon's lonely farmhouse near Carmel. There the day-to-day agony of Jacob's love for Runyon is deepened and complicated when one night he sees Runyon's mother forcing the door of her son's room. From that day his only hope is that he and Runyon and Runyon's sister Fern, for whom he has developed a mild affection, may live together away from the mother's crazy influence. This hope is shattered on the day before their departure, when Jacob comes upon the brother and sister in each other's arms. "Alas, poor Jacob! . . . Paradise was not for him." It seems curious that an author who accepts inversion calmly should become morally outraged at incest. For the rest, the people in "Shadows Flying" are so dull, aside from their vices, and so solemn in the midst of them, that one is relieved to reach the end of the book and to find the author's assurance that "The characters in this work are wholly fictional and imaginary."

M. F.

Rain on the Just, by Kathleen Morehouse. New York: Lee Furman. $2.50.

Since Kathleen Morehouse, "a prodigious reader from the age of four," gave her college course "the expected literary emphasis . . . worked in one of the finer grocery stores (where she took Amy Lowell's grocery order) . . . then in one of the finer publishing houses on Beacon Hill . . . married a Harvard man" (one of the finer ones, doubtless, or aren't they all?), yachted luxuriously and was headmaster's wife in an exclusive prep school, it should follow that she has written one of the finer novels of the Poor White South. The characters "are Elizabethan . . . warm and loving. . . . Their speech recalls . . . Shakespeare." This would be in the Maristan Chapman tradition. But Mrs. Morehouse is a "furriner." Living in the North Carolina mountains since 1929, her emotion over folkways has produced a thinly reminiscent and synthetic story. It lacks the poetic realism, the beauty of speech and style, the strong sense of significant detail that make the best books of this type a rather moving esthetic experience and a satisfying escape to primitive life. The jacket strikes a new high for unconscious humor and sales-talk snobbery.

C. G. S.

Contributors

H. N. Brailsford, a specialist in foreign affairs, is the London correspondent of The New Republic. He is the author of a number of books, the latest being "Voltaire."

Ernest Sutherland Bates's most recent books were published this spring—"Hearst: Lord of San Simeon" (with Oliver Carlson) and "The Story of Congress—1789-1935." He has written several others.

Willie Sue Blagden, though she has recently been living in Boston, was born and lived for many years in Memphis, Tennessee, where she was at one time connected with the Associated Charities. Her brother, George Blagden, now a lawyer, was once a champion long-distance swimmer.

Kenneth Burke is the author of "Permanence and Change," which was published in The New Republic Dollar series, as well as other books. He is now doing research for another.

John Collier is the federal Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Newton Arvin, the author of a biography of Hawthorne, is now working on a book about Walt Whitman.

George Seldes is the author, among other books, of "The Freedom of the Press" and a biography of Mussolini, "Sawdust Caesar."

George Milburn's first novel, "Catalogue," will be published by Harcourt, Brace in September. He is the author of two volumes of short stories, "Oklahoma Town" and "No More Trumpets."

Hans Kohn is professor of Modern History at Smith College. Among his books are "Nationalism and Imperialism in the Hither East," "Nationalism in Soviet Russia" and "Western Civilization in the Near East."

Isidor Schneider, novelist and poet, has been for many years a student of Oriental history.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Martha Gruening, Harold Ward, Margaret Frohnknecht and Clara G. Stillman.

A COMPLETE MODERN CAMP for ADULTS in the Adirondacks
New 22-Room Club-house, each room with private bath
Private golf course, tennis courts and all other sports facilities.
Complete Theatre
Chamber Music by Manhattan String Quartet
Moderate Rates
Reduced Fare $4.30 one way to Lake George
Inquire for Special July 4th Weekend Rate
Communicate: Warrensburg, New York, or City Office, 11 W. 42nd St., N. Y. — COlumbus 5-6346.
Lena Barish - Sam Garlen
Directors

A Delightful Hide-Away
in the mountains, inviting people of better taste. Tennis, handball, swimming, roller skating, other seasonal sports, solariums, excellent table. Open fireplaces, library, cultural entertainment, and loads of spontaneous fun.
Chesters' Zunbarg
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel: Fallsburg 2 F 22

SUMMER RATES
For Camps, Resorts, Houses to Rent and for Sale, Apartments, etc.
DISPLAY RATES:
One inch:
1 insertion.. $4.00
3 insertions. $3.50
6 insertions. $3.00
CLASSIFIED RATE:
One line of 6 point type (6 words) 40c; One line of 5 point type (7-8 words) 33 1/3c.
THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y.

THE COLONY CLUB WOODSTOCK, N. Y.
in the Catskills
Modern comforts and old world charm amidst beautiful surroundings. Every room with private bath and shower. Fireproof. Center of all cultural and social activities in famous art colony. Exceptionally moderate rates. For information and reservations address: THE COLONY CLUB, WOODSTOCK, N. Y., or telephone Woodstock 200.

SUMMER TERM REGISTRATION
now going on at the
WORKERS SCHOOL 35 EAST 12th STREET
Tel: ALgonquin 4-1199
COURSES IN:
Political Economy
Marxism-Leninism
Trade Union Problems
Historical Materialism
Social and Political Forces in American History
Marxist-Leninist Approach to Literature
Public Speaking
Descriptive Catalogue Obtainable Upon Request—Day courses offered

INSTRUCTION

Augustin Duncan
VOICE TRAINING
for STAGE, PLATFORM and RADIO
Private and Class Instruction
STUDIO: 168 EAST 51st ST., NEW YORK CITY

COUNTRY HOME
A COUNTRY HOME for liberals in Northern Vermont. Small group. Excellent accommodation. Semi-Cooperative. Rates reasonable. Write Box 471, Derby Line, Vermont.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUBS
AN UNUSUAL CLUB for unusual people. Unusual books loaned. Send 3-cent stamp. Contacts, Box 91, Station D, New York City.

SUMMER SUBLET
ENTIRE FLOOR, 4 rooms, beautifully furnished. Grand piano; quiet; cool. East 18th St. $55 monthly. GRamercy 5-6065, evenings.

SCHOLARSHIPS
PROGRESSIVE GIRLS' SCHOOL with increased facilities for enrollment offers $200 scholarships in junior and senior high school, to children of unusual ability. Address: Box 928, The New Republic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED